





Pacific Studies

Vol. 8, No. 2 - Spring 1985

PACIFIC STUDIES

a journal devoted to the study of the Pacific—
its islands and adjacent countries

SPRING 1985

Anthropology
Archaeology
Art History
Ethnomusicology
Folklore
Geography
History
Sociolinguistics
Literary Criticism
Political Science
Sociology

Published by

THE INSTITUTE FOR POLYNESIAN STUDIES
(Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus)

Funded by the
Polynesian Cultural Center

EDITORIAL BOARD

Fergus Clunie	<i>Fiji Museum</i>
Roger Green	<i>University of Auckland</i>
Renée Heyum	<i>University of Hawaii</i>
Francis X. Hezel, S.J.	<i>Micronesian Seminar</i>
Rubellite Johnson	<i>University of Hawaii</i>
Adrienne Kaeppler	<i>Smithsonian Institution</i>
Robert Kiste	<i>University of Hawaii</i>
Robert Langdon	<i>Australian National University</i>
Ioane LeMamea	<i>Pacific Islanders'</i> <i>Educational Research Center, N.Z.</i>
Stephen Levine	<i>Victoria University</i>
Katharine Luomala	<i>University of Hawaii</i>
Barrie Macdonald	<i>Massey University</i>
Cluny Macpherson	<i>University of Auckland</i>
Leonard Mason	<i>University of Hawaii</i>
Malama Meleisea	<i>University of the South Pacific</i>
Norman Meller	<i>University of Hawaii</i>
Richard M. Moyle	<i>University of Auckland</i>
Colin Newbury	<i>Oxford University</i>
Douglas Oliver	<i>University of Hawaii</i>
Margaret Orbell	<i>Canterbury University</i>
Nancy Pollock	<i>Victoria University</i>
Karl Rensch	<i>Australian National University</i>
Bradd Shore	<i>Emory University</i>
Yosihiko Sinoto	<i>Bishop Museum</i>
William Tagupa	<i>Office of Hawaiian Affairs</i>
Francisco Orrego Vicuña	<i>Universidad de Chile</i>
Tuaopepe Felix Wendt	<i>University of the South Pacific</i>
Edward Wolfers	<i>Macquarie University</i>

PACIFIC STUDIES

Editor

DALE B. ROBERTSON

Associate Editor

GLORIA L. CRONIN

Associate Editor

ANITA HENRY

Editorial Policy


Pacific Studies is published twice yearly by The Institute for Polynesian Studies, Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus, Laie, Hawaii, 96762, but responsibility for opinions expressed in the articles rests with the writers alone.

Subscription rate is US \$15.00. Accounts payable to The Institute for Polynesian Studies should be sent to the editor. Articles submitted to the editor should be the original typewritten copy, double spaced, following a recognized, scholarly style. Books for review should also be sent to the editor.

The Institute for Polynesian Studies, Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus, is an organization funded by the Polynesian Cultural Center. The Institute assists the Center in meeting its cultural and educational goals by undertaking a program for teaching, research, and publication. The Institute cooperates with other scholarly and research institutions in achieving their objectives. It publishes monographs, produces films, underwrites research, and sponsors conferences on the Pacific islands. Further information on the activities of the Institute may be obtained by writing to its Director, Jerry K. Loveland, at the address above.

©1985 Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus. All Rights Reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

ISSN 0275-3596



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
Consortium of Church Libraries and Archives

CONTENTS

Articles

<i>“Rubbish Boy and the Two Queens, or Humbling the Haughty In-Laws.” Family Relationships in a Folktale from the Gilbert Islands</i>	
KATHARINE LUOMALA	1
<i>Time-Expired Melanesian Labor in Queensland: An Investigation of Job Turnover, 1884–1906</i>	
RALPH SHLOMOWITZ	25
<i>The Commercial Timber Industry in Colonial Papua New Guinea</i>	
W. J. JONAS	45
<i>Race Relations in the Pre-Colonial Pacific Islands: A Case of Prejudice and Pragmatism</i>	
I. C. CAMPBELL	61

Editor’s Forum

<i>Pacific History as Seen from the Pacific Islands</i>	
DAVID ROUTLEDGE	81

Book Review Forum

<i>Douglas Oliver, Two Tahitian Villages: A Study in Comparison</i>	
GREG DENING	101
F. ALLAN HANSON	103
PAUL SHANKMAN	106
<i>Response: DOUGLAS OLIVER</i>	108

Reviews

- Ahmed Ali, Ron Crocombe, and Ronald Gordon, eds.,
Politics in Polynesia
 (WILLIAM E. H. TAGUPA) 113
- Judith Binney, Gillian Chaplin, and Craig Wallace, *Mihaia:*
The Prophet Rua Kenana and
His Community at Maungapohatu
- Peter Webster, *Rua and the Maori Millenium*
 (KAREN P. SINCLAIR) 117
- Gilbert Cuzent, *Archipel de Tahiti: Recherches sur*
les principales productions végétales.
 Revised and expanded edition
 (F. R. FOSBERG) 125
- Marion Kelly, *Nā Mala o Kona, The Gardens of Kona:*
A History of Land Use in Kona, Hawai'i
 (WILLIAM E. H. TAGUPA) 129
- The Politics of Evolving Cultures in the Pacific Islands.*
 Proceedings of a Conference Sponsored by
 The Institute for Polynesian Studies
 (R. A. HERR) 130
- Paul Sillitoe, *Roots of the Earth: Crops in the Highlands*
of Papua New Guinea
 (TERENCE E. HAYS) 133
- Ronald Takaki, *Pau Hana: Plantation Life and Labor in Hawaii*
 (NOEL J. KENT) 135

PACIFIC STUDIES

Vol. 8, No. 2

Spring 1985

"RUBBISH BOY AND THE TWO QUEENS, OR HUMBLING THE HAUGHTY IN-LAWS." FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS IN A FOLKTALE FROM THE GILBERT ISLANDS¹

by Katharine Luomala

Introduction

This entertaining, suspense-filled, and fairly well-constructed folktale was written in Gilbertese sometime between 1910 and 1936 by Ten Tirora, a man of Tarawa, Gilbert Islands (Republic of Kiribati).² My somewhat literal translation is part of this paper. In the first two parts of this three-part story, a rejected, unpromising hero, who is a "Male Cinderella" and an "Ugly Duckling," overcomes his physical handicaps and his rivals to win completely the love of two queens. One is his mother whom he alienates from his father and brother. The other becomes his bride when she at last prefers him, although apparently a poor man, to his royal brother, who thus becomes a two-time loser. The third part climaxes his success when his royal bride's angry relatives arrive to insult the presumably starving couple with a gift of smelly wild fruit. However, they are humbled by the overwhelming display of wealth in food and shelter offered them.

It is not until early in the second part that the narrator tells his audience what the hero, although suspicious, does not know: namely, that his mother is really Queen of Mōne (Underworld), and it is her magic and authority that are changing his life. Even by the end of the story the narrator never explicitly states that the hero and his bride know the secret of his reversal of fortune.

As in any *märchen* one accepts the telescoping of time, fantastic events, repetitions, inconsistencies, and unexplained details, perhaps to puzzle over them and discuss them with the storyteller later.³ The characters are either minor gods or demigods with problems like those of human beings but with supernatural means to resolve them.⁴ My focus will be on their family relationships, which are distorted reflections of real life as are the opposite examples present in other narratives. Discussion of each of the story's three parts will be preceded by a summary.

Part 1

A. The hero is a deformed infant called Bebeti (Rubbish), who is never fed and is hidden in a basket so that neighbors cannot jeer and shame his father, Te-boka-marawa. When his handsome younger brother, Na-ikamawa, becomes their father's pet, Bebeti gets his sympathetic mother, Nei Baka-torotoro, to take his basket and flee with him.

B. During their flight he leaves his basket to catch many large fish, overcomes his undescribed deformity so that he can walk, and names himself Nā-ibunaki. His father, having followed the fugitives on three successive occasions to threaten them and demand their return, gives up after meeting them the third time and not recognizing them. The mother, as instructed by the boy, calls for Nā-ibunaki in an old woman's quavering voice and tells Te-boka-marawa that a woman with a basket has gone ahead of them. Te-boka-marawa, whose body blazes like a fisherman's torch, then settles down at Bikentoka, Tarawa.

As the father, now vanquished, disappears from the story, the hero, it is evident, has successfully displaced him and his brother in his mother's affection and is now her sole companion. He has shown amazing initiative, courage, and intelligence, and appears to have been the active agent of change while his mother passively followed his lead. It is he, not his mother, who twice defies Te-boka-marawa, and although it is she who speaks to Te-boka-marawa the third time, she is following her son's advice. The boy's courage and wit are indirectly emphasized by the narrator's comment about Te-boka-marawa's fiery body. His audience knows that Te-boka-marawa is the evil god who leads torchlight fishermen to their deaths. Perhaps his nature frightened his wife into initially agreeing to hide and ignore their deformed first-born son.

Gilbertese narratives do not all portray fathers hostile to some or all of their sons and mothers as nurturing. The best example of the opposite tells of Na Areau, a creator, culture hero, and trickster, protecting his three sons on a journey to Tāmoa from their cannibalistic mother, Tina-tau-te-koka, who is as evil as Te-boka-marawa.⁵ To lure the party ashore for the night on her movable island in order to eat her sons, the goddess used three different disguises, two of which Na Areau told her did not deceive him. That the third did is not clear, but at any rate she got them ashore. However, Na Areau had the boys put white shells over their eyes as if they were awake watching her (a well-known Oceanic device) and she failed. The next morning, at her request, he left one son to pick coconuts for her but told him how to evade her and rejoin the canoe. Again she pursued them in three different disguises, but at last Na Areau "killed" this would-be devouring mother and the party sailed on to Tāmoa.

Another protective father was the god Bakoa (Shark) who lived in the ocean with his sons by two wives.⁶ He guarded one son, Taburi-mai, a human-looking youth, from his half-brothers who being fish were ashamed of Taburi-mai looking different and plotted to kill him. Bakoa had Taburi-mai's full brother Te-anoi (Hammerhead Shark) carry him to safety in Tāmoa. Subsequently, Taburi-mai voyaged to Tarawa where he married Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa; from this couple Anetipa, Sir Arthur Grimble's informant on Nui, Ellices (Tuvalu), claimed descent.⁷ Nā-ibunaki's bride, it happens, was also named Te-arei-n-Tarawa. As neither woman's parentage is given it is unknown how or if they were related; however, the same name is often passed down in a family. A third woman with the same name, and also of unknown parentage, will be noted later.

In some narratives the contrast between the favoritism and love of one or both parents for a handsome son and their shame and rejection of one originating as a monstrous birth leads inevitably to the latter's jealousy and revenge against his brother. Na Areau is again a prime example.⁸ According to one myth, he was hidden away in a basket under the eaves (like Bebeti), presumably because he too looked different, being tiny, very dark-skinned, and possessed of ugly teeth like black stones. His brother, Auriaria, did not know he existed. Auriaria, after being advised and dressed in his armor by their doting father, Tabakea (Hawksbill Turtle), led his warriors against Tangaroa's army to determine who would rule Tāmoa. For two successive days, Na Areau sneaked out of his basket to fight successfully on Tangaroa's side and nearly killed Auriaria. Tabakea, hearing about the mysterious warrior,

guessed it was Na Areau. On the third day he secretly told Auriaria that as the man had too much magic to be killed by weapons he should make him laugh, and when he covered his mouth to hide his ugly teeth of which he was ashamed, he should grab and thrash him. The plan worked except that Na Areau escaped and got into his basket before his pursuing brother arrived. When Tabakea told Auriaria that the warrior was his brother, the discouraged general negotiated with Tangaroa to divide the rule, while Tabakea advised Na Areau to leave home to escape his brother's wrath.

Another example of contrasting treatment of sons is in a clan tradition about Aro-matang, a first-born son who was a man-bird.⁹ His ashamed parents hid him away, made him a nest, and treated him like a bird. When the rejected offspring became a cannibal and demanded his beautiful newborn brother as food, the unhappy parents gave the infant to fishermen to take away. They left him on a barren shore where, immediately and completely self-sufficient, he lived under a *ren*-tree (*Messerschmidia argentea*) until adolescence. At that time a king found and adopted him, named him Te-ibi-aro-ni-kai, and greatly indulged him. Eventually Aro-matang killed him but he himself died at the hands of Komoenga, Te-ibi's son and Aro-matang's heir.

Bebeti, or Nā-ibunaki as he preferred to be called, was luckier than both Aro-matang and tiny, black-skinned Na Areau in having a sympathetic mother who preferred him, although deformed, to his handsome brother and helped him overcome all handicaps. How fortunate he was is revealed in the second part of the story.

Part 2

A. Mother and son live, scorned by neighboring villages, in a barren area under a *ren*-tree but eat good food. Nā-ibunaki, unaware that Baka-torotoro is Queen of Mōne and has an entry to the Underworld under the tree, wonders how she gets the food and if she was responsible for their flight, his fishing luck, his cure, and his father not recognizing them. Meanwhile he has become disfigured with yaws.

B. Na-ikamawa, now king of a southern village, happens to see Nā-ibunaki, and thinking him unlikely to be a rival, invites him to Queen Te-arei-n-Tarawa's games in a northern village. Nā-ibunaki, urged by his mother, reluctantly goes along to watch. For two successive days, the young queen favors Na-ikamawa, so handsome that lightning flashes around him, but

insults Nā-ibunaki by worrying that, although he keeps moving farther and farther away, he might touch her ball or her swing.

C. Before the third visit, the mother's people beautify the unhappy Nā-ibunaki until his lightning outshines Na-ikamawa's. The now apologetic and enamored queen begs him to play, but he, as advised by his mother, refuses. He says that he is unclean, that she should play with Na-ikamawa. When she offers to follow him and be his slave, he again refuses because of his poverty. Ignoring her kinship group's commands and warnings, she follows him, saying that she will share his poverty. At the *ren-tree* Baka-torotoro welcomes her, and the queen is astonished by the fine meal, which she says is too good to be the drift food that Nā-ibunaki claims it is.

Nā-ibunaki has now won a second queen's love and for the second time has displaced his brother, who now disappears from the story. It is ironic that Na-ikamawa should have chosen Nā-ibunaki as his companion. The narrator not only uses Na-ikamawa to unite the first two parts of the story but gives Nā-ibunaki revenge over his brother, of which, however, he is unaware. The storyteller does not reveal whether the brothers ever recognized each other. That the mother may have recognized Na-ikamawa seems suggested by the storyteller's comment that she thinks the newly beautified Nā-ibunaki is now the best of her children. In this second part Nā-ibunaki displays none of the attractive qualities evident in the first part. Instead he is a passive, complaining beneficiary of his mother's help. Like Cinderella's fairy godmother she does everything for him.

Queen Te-arei-n-Tarawa fits the archetype of the Gilbertese "woman of the games" (*te aine n te takākaro*), a highborn girl, sometimes of divine or semidivine parentage, who is a sheltered but strong-minded and impulsive virgin who meets her future husband (or one of them), a complete stranger often from another island, at games over which she presides. Then without further ado, she expresses her love and marries him, usually without consulting her parents or their even being mentioned in the matter. The intervention of Te-arei-n-Tarawa's parents and other kin is therefore of special interest.

The waywardness of these girls contrasts with the restraints on women in real life. As listeners are well aware, they are eloping—that is, completely circumventing the involved traditional arrangements that their well-to-do real or adoptive parents have surely made for their marriage, perhaps even before their birth.¹⁰ Once both families' hopes

for the birth of a girl were realized, the prospective groom's side gave the other side a piece of land. On approaching puberty the girl was secluded in a special house (*kō* or *roki*) to bleach her skin, beautify her, guard her virginity, and by much magic ensure her a future good life. Both kinship groups now began to assemble food, mats, perfumed oil, and the like in order to outdo each other in their exchange of a series of ritual visits, feasts, and gifts. After the wedding, also an important event, came another series of ritual visits, feasts, and gifts. On the other hand, if the marriage did not take place or if the bride proved not to be a virgin, fighting broke out until a mediator halted it and indemnities were negotiated. Listeners realize all this and more as storytellers tell about these mythical or ancestral renegade women of the games for whom love outweighed obedience to kinship obligations. And the youths too, it must not be forgotten, were also defying custom by marrying them.

When in her sheltered adolescence could the daughter of a well-to-do family become a girl of the games and be swung by young, unmarried men and play ball with them? Traditional custom suggests when such an interval occurred. A family, a kinship group (*utu*), or a village may select a girl as their representative, someone like a Samoan *taupou*. She was *te karianako* "the superlative one," "the favorite," or as Tabiteueans said in English, "the favorite daughter." She was secluded at puberty in the *kō* to undergo the rituals and treatment. This would be a source of pride to her all her life, and she would brag that her parents showed her special love by having her become *te kanoa n te kō* "the contents of the *kō*." Once she emerged she was dressed in the "favorite daughter" costume and, until forbidden by British law, this debutante was paraded from village to village to display her beauty and at each to be the guest at feasts, games, sports, and dances in her honor, and to play with young, unmarried youths in games considered suitable for a girl.¹¹

Swinging was eminently suitable and a means for all to admire her and for young men to show off their grace and dexterity.¹² Other myths besides that about Queen Te-arei-n-Tarawa emphasize swinging as the occasion when a headstrong girl of the games meets and falls in love with a stranger. In this game, a single sennit rope was fastened to a leaning coconut tree, with the free end of the rope knotted into a loop to be covered with a mat as the girl's seat, some six or seven feet above the ground. If an extra piece of rope was hung under the seat, the youth seized it to get the swing moving, then ran holding the rope to swing higher and higher and finally turn in midair so that he and the girl faced the spectators. When he returned to the lowest point, he jumped

away and another youth took his place. If there was no holding rope, the youth pushed the swing as high as he could and when it returned, leaped to grab the rope above the girl and whirl with her. If he missed, he was humiliated and another couple took his and the girl's place. If the seat was a four-foot club, secured to be parallel to the ground and the girl astride the rope, the youth held each end of the seat to swing as high and as often as he could. Spectators clapped and chanted praises for a good performance. Gilbertese would probably never have permitted a couple, as in traditional Hawai'i, to sit together on the seat facing each other.

That accidents happened is revealed in a clan tradition about an ancestress, Nei Komake, of unreported parentage and presumably a girl of the games, who "swung and swung under Karawa (Heaven) when lo! she accidentally slipped from her swing and fell on . . . the land of Namoto" who found her, miraculously uninjured, and took her to his wife, Nei Nikuau.¹³ Apparently having no previous marriage arrangements for their son, Ten Nautonga, they arranged a marriage for him with this woman from the sky.

A cryptic myth tells of Auriaria, son of Tabakea and Nei Unikāi (Blue Shark), looking across the ocean from the eastern side of Tarawa, his land of birth, to Marakei and seeing Nei Rēi being swung on her swing.¹⁴ Auriaria, who had been performing the *Kauti*, or Awakening, ceremony to make him a brave warrior, left it to walk across the ocean to Marakei. It was highly improper and magically dangerous to leave the ceremony and even worse to do so for a woman. Lady Rēi, obviously something of a magician, told her companions that she had invited him and got down from her swing to meet him. When he was about to leave (what happened before then is not told), Lady Rēi declared, "Listen to me because I burn for you!" So they were married. Later he returned to Tarawa where, before resuming his interrupted Awakening ceremony, he married Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa and Nei Tituābine. The decision to marry was, it seems, entirely between Auriaria and these women, as well as three more he married later. However, Lady Rēi was the only one who had been swinging when he first noticed her. The Lady Te-arei-n-Tarawa he married is the third of that name I have found in the narratives, but how they are related, if they are, is unknown since the parentage is not given for any of them. However, names are passed down in families.

The most famous girl of the games was Nei Teweia, daughter of a royal couple on Beru and named in many genealogies. News of her superlative beauty and of her games spread in all four directions. On

Tarawa three brothers—Uamumuri, Nanikain, and Tabutoa, all of them giants and sons of the goddess Nei Nimanoa and Naubwebwe, the slave and cook of King Beia-ma-te-kai—decided to go to the games. Their mother, on arriving from Tāmoa, had fallen in love and married Naubwebwe, but she and the sons did not know he was a slave until the sons were grown. One variant states that she told the giants about the Beru girl, advised them to go to Beru, and pointed out that their future on Tarawa as sons of a slave was dim.¹⁵ When, as most variants state, they stopped off at Tabiteuea, a man there warned them not to abduct the girl of the games, although they had not intimated that they were interested in more than the games.

One variant specifically mentions swinging as the game the giants first watched, then took their turn in swinging Nei Teweia, and, as the narrator comments, observed how desirably marriageable she was.¹⁶ They fell in love with her, carried her off despite the crowd around her, put her on their canoe, and sailed away. According to the story, she became pregnant by the three brothers, but all of them died by magic not long before she married none other than King Beia-ma-te-kai. She named her child of these four fathers Tanentoa-of-the-West to distinguish him from her royal father Tanentoa-of-Beru. If, as the narrators of these variations frequently do, Beia-ma-te-kai is regarded as really two highborn lords, Beia and (*ma*) Te-kai, Nei Teweia's son had five fathers.

Another sudden marriage between two royal strangers was arranged but by surrogate parents who were as unusual as their planning.¹⁷ While he and his squire were bonito-fishing, Te-ibi-aro-ni-kai's three pet pigeons happened to meet Nei Arotaim's three pet pigeons. After each flock had inspected the other's owner, they agreed the two should marry. The two were notified. Then Te-ibi's birds guided his canoe to Arotaim's land, where, since it was night, she was lounging around a big fire while her companions danced for her. Dismissing them, she greeted Te-ibi, who inquired about her father. Apparently already informed of the impending marriage, he was called and invited Te-ibi to make an extended visit. However, Te-ibi regretted that he and Arotaim must leave in the morning as his people would worry about his absence. Back in her husband's land, Arotaim became both Te-ibi's and his adopted father's wife and bore Komoenga, the son who was to kill Aromatang who slew Te-ibi before Komoenga's birth.

In all these narratives, family concern about a child's physical appearance has been obvious. Nā-ibunaki's "looking different" dominates the first two parts of the story. Family members express rejection

of Na Areau, Taburi-mai, and Aro-matang who also "look different." Te-ibi and Auriaria presumably were handsome although they lacked the lightning around them like Na-ikamawa. The headstrong girls of the games were doubtless beautiful if not as beautiful as Nei Teweia. An occasional narrative has an unattractive girl.¹⁸ One was so repulsive the sky gods would not touch their ball if it fell near her. When her parents treated her with an irresistible perfumed oil, she chose to play with a handsome god instead of the ugly one her parents had recommended. When the ugly god turned handsome she pursued him but he ran away. She has never caught him for he is Rimwimāta (Antares) and she is Nei Auti (Pleiades).

That Nā-ibunaki's changed appearance and extra-bright lightning might have had social and economic significance did not occur to Te-arei-n-Tarawa, her clan, or Nā-ibunaki himself. Part 2 emphasizes the value of high rank and its associated wealth, respect, and authority, contrasting the status of Na-ikamawa, the queen, and her clan with that of Nā-ibunaki and his mother. The young queen's reaction throughout this part has been only to Nā-ibunaki's appearance, also very important to the plot. Her initial disgust has turned to infatuation strong enough for her to give up everything for him. This part ends on a happy note with her apparent sacrifice rewarded by Baka-torotoro's welcome and the good food ready for her.

Part 3

About two days later, her clan (*utu*), reluctant, it said, to have the couple starve to death, fills canoes with *non*-fruit (*Morinda citrifolia*) for them. Seeing the canoes coming, Baka-torotoro orders Mōne to send up a large house filled with good food for the guests. Te-arei-n-Tarawa, seeing it on waking up from a nap, wonders where it all came from. When her arriving clan tells her what their cargo is, she orders them to dump it before they are shamed by insulting a household that eats only good food and has a large guest house full of food for them. They obey, and Baka-torotoro and Nā-ibunaki offer them food and eat with them. When, after three days of feasting, they decide to go home, Baka-torotoro orders up so much food (eight delicacies are named) for their journey that it swamps their canoes.¹⁹ The place is now called Te Tebonoua "The Swamp-ing," or "The Shaming of the Proud and the Lofty." Amen.²⁰

It is traditional for a man's father to provide a young couple with everything needed. In Te-boka-marawa's absence, Baka-torotoro looks after the two. The arrival of the bride's clan within two days after the marriage ignores traditional protocol, but shows how eager its members are to gloat over her downfall and further humiliate her with food considered good enough only for poor people who live under a tree.

Traditionally, the first visit after a wedding is by the groom's relatives who, loaded with gifts, visit the bride's kin who await their visit with enough food to last a week or more. When the guests leave, the bride's relatives accompany them to carry gifts of food to their village where they will be entertained for as long as they wish to stay. Later, women of the groom's family will visit the bride's kin with gifts of mats, and will be given new grass skirts to change into and will be feasted and entertained. Ritualized greetings and farewells mark each visit. Each family tries to outdo the other in gifts and hospitality, and subsequently enjoys discussing what each family gave and which gave the most and the best.

The story reveals the bride's clan as ungenerous and insulting as well as unmannerly by initiating the series of visits and by bringing such a shameful gift. The groom's sole provider's hospitality and supply of fine food contrast with the visitors' behavior. The contrast is further sharpened by the narrator naming the delicacies ordered for the journey home, the amount of which swamps the guests' canoes. A special source of pleasure for the Gilbertese is to hear about Baka-torotoro getting so much food without the intensive labor necessary for most—particularly in the drier southern islands—just to get enough to eat to survive.

Nā-ibunaki is scarcely mentioned in Part 3. It is Baka-torotoro who acts as the agent, able to shame her daughter-in-law's clan with her generosity. However, the only direct conversations are between the bride and her mean clan members and then among the members themselves. The bride describes at length the good food she has eaten and, in a critical and often sarcastic tirade, has them get rid of the *non* before the household sees it. It is, of course, her triumph in having been right in choosing Nā-ibunaki as her husband and proving her clan wrong. But to the very end of the story she, and perhaps Nā-ibunaki, and of course her clan, do not know where Baka-torotoro gets all these things and have no inkling that she is Queen of Mōne.

In this story of make-believe, which turns many traditional Gilbertese family relationships and customs topsy-turvy to make dreams come true, are basic situations in which the ugly become handsome and the poor become rich and love conquers all, situations that would make this folktale appealing to people far beyond the Pacific area.

An Old Story from Northern Gilberts
[By Tirora, Buariki, Tarawa]

Information about Nā-ibunaki: Nā-ibunaki is the child of Nei [Lady] Baka-torotoro and Te-boka-marawa, and speaking of them (a) Te-boka-marawa is a person of the sea, a native of the ocean, (b) Nei-Baka-torotoro is a person of the land.

Now after Te-boka-marawa has become Nei Baka-torotoro's husband, Nei Baka-torotoro gives birth one day to a baby, a male. Seeing that the child is badly deformed, they refuse to take care of him. And putting him inside an open basket, they hang him up in a place where people will not see him because they fear disgrace from him. Because the child is not like a human being, he being deformed in appearance, they name him Bebeti [Rubbish]—and the name Bebeti means a person who is inferior, who is, so to speak, an imbecile, or perhaps a spirit (*anti*) without value, without use, who has but slight power (*maka*).

Later Te-boka-marawa and Nei Baka-torotoro have two children, males. The name of one is Na-ikamawa, and the name Na-ikamawa means, it seems, "The beautiful and best one." The second child's name is unknown but he too is a child handsome in appearance, and the story says that perhaps his name is also Na-ikamawa. Te-boka-marawa and Nei Baka-torotoro have, then, three children.

Te-boka-marawa much loves his handsome, later-born child known as Na-ikamawa. He feeds him regularly and gives him something to drink. However, he unkindly neglects his first child Bebeti so that he just hangs inside the basket every day without being given food. And Bebeti, hearing his mother's voice when she walks near him, calls to her, and he says to her, "Baka-torotoro!" His mother hears his voice and questions her child, saying, "My child, so you are really healthy even though you hang up inside this open basket! I shall certainly take care of you, but you know that your father does not love you because of your being deformed, and he is ashamed to acknowledge you."

The youngster, Bebeti, tells her to untie the open basket in which he lives, and his mother unties it according to her child's request to her. When she has finished drawing the open basket down to the ground the baby, Bebeti, says to his mother, "Take me away, and the two of us will live in a place very distant from my father's land because I am very unhappy that my father hates me."

The mother lifts up the open basket in which her child stays and they start out. They stay in a very distant place and continue to reside there.

Bebeti tells his mother, "Get coconut fiber to twist into sennit." His mother twists it and it is ready. Bebeti comes down from inside the open basket and goes fishing in the ocean. When he returns from fishing he has very numerous large fish, and as they are unable to eat all they dry them in the sunshine.

Te-boka-marawa, his father, is determined to find Nei Baka-torotoro and his deformed child, Te-bebeti, and he just happens on the place where they are living. He joins them at the place but the baby, Bebeti, refuses to accompany him. The father leaves them but he says to them, "I shall come back to you again tomorrow." And he goes away from them. Bebeti, speaking to his mother, says, "We ought to leave again because Te-boka-marawa says that he will come back again tomorrow morning."

And they again travel. Going away, they betake themselves farther so that Te-boka-marawa will not see them. They arrive at a certain place where they again settle down, and Bebeti again goes fishing and catches many fish, and they are unable to eat them all, and they dry them in the sunshine.

And they are again looked for by Te-boka-marawa in the place where they first stayed, and they are again found in their [new] place. He says, "I am disgusted with having looked for you in the place where you first stayed and not finding you since you are really staying here. Now that I have arrived, you will accompany me to the place where I live." And Bebeti again refuses to go along, and Te-boka-marawa leaves again, but he says to them, "I shall return to call for you again tomorrow morning, so goodbye now but don't leave here again if you want to stay healthy."

And Bebeti again speaks to his mother, saying, "We shall go again but do not lift me up again because I am now able to walk on my legs." And the two travel together, and Bebeti says to his mother, "Look, I tell you Te-boka-marawa will arrive soon—this night. He will have discovered us again by means of magical spells, and will again want to escort us to his place. Therefore, I want to tell you that when he discovers us again we will do a certain magic trick (*kunemān*) so that he won't recognize us. You shall call me Nā-ibunaki when Te-boka-marawa arrives, and you shall change your way of speaking to make your voice tremble. And then if we are changed in this way he will not be able to recognize us."

And when they are engaged in walking along on their very distant route they turn around and see Te-boka-marawa who has almost reached them. Her voice trembling, Nei Baka-torotoro calls and calls, calling the name of her child, thus, "Nā-ibunaki, wait for me." And she again calls and calls in this way, and Te-boka-marawa hears the name

Nā-ibunaki and the shaky voice of the woman. Te-boka-marawa halts and he says to them, "What people did you see while you were walking along?" And they say, "Well, there was a woman ahead of us, and she had a burden, a basket in which a deformed child stayed." And Te-boka-marawa says to himself, "I shall go back because I cannot again discover the place where they are now staying." He does not know who she is who addressed him! Te-boka-marawa turns around to go back and he goes to stay at Bikentoka, on Tarawa. And his body is the fire that blazes, for example, like the fire that is in a canoe fishing by torchlight.

And Nā-ibunaki, who is Bebeti, stays in an uninhabited land between villages, the narrow part of the island without trees on it, an "itimati" [isthmus], so to speak. The only tree on it is a *ren* [*Messerschmidia argentea*, tree heliotrope], and they—Nā-ibunaki himself and his mother, Nei Baka-torotoro—dwell under its shade. There are indeed several villages to the north where people live. In the village to the north there is a queen, Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa, and in the village to the south there is a king. His name is Na-ikamawa who is really his brother, the one his father, Te-boka-marawa, loves.

Nā-ibunaki and his mother, Nei Baka-torotoro, continue to live under that *ren*-tree. And there is something under that *ren*-tree, a cave down to Mōne [Underworld], which is really the village of his mother, Nei Baka-torotoro, for Nei Baka-torotoro is none other than the Queen of Mōne, but Nā-ibunaki, her child, does not know this yet. That cave's opening is screened by Lady Baka-torotoro, and they settle down under that *ren*-tree. When they have settled down a while they are hungry, and Nei Baka-torotoro lifts up the mat-screen to speak with that cave regarding her food and her child's. When she puts her hand in the cave she is given the food that has just come from the fire—fish, *babai* corms [*Cyrtosperma chamissonis*, taro], toddy molasses (*kamaimai*)—already mixed inside two coconut shells. She calls her child and says, "Come here because we are going to eat these things I luckily found here." Her child arrives, and he wonders at those things—good and hot besides—and they eat as well as drink.

He does not question his mother about a thing. He merely is preoccupied pondering his mother's daily habits: (a) First he ponders her way when she was afraid to look after him, and he thinks that maybe his mother cured him and he does not know about it. (b) He ponders her way when they rose and went away with hurt feelings; and when he went fishing, his catch was large, and he does not know if, perhaps, it was also through his mother. (c) He ponders, too, her way when their bodies could not be recognized by Te-boka-marawa on account of the

name and the speech, and he truly did not know them; and he supposes, in his thoughts, that perhaps this too was through his mother. More light is going to be shed on it by their dwelling in that section between villages where there are no food trees yet they eat good food and have cool water although there are no coconut trees or garden pits or a well either. However, daily without exception they keep on getting things.

A sickness comes on Nā-ibunaki's body—yaws, a skin disease, an unclean sickness. The two villages hear that there are people on the isthmus between them, pitiable people without a house, and the country also hears of a man who is sick and without food. However, there are none who want to befriend them, none who will help them.

The games! Yes, there are games in the northern village—swinging and *oreano* [usually a man's game played with a heavy ball]; yes, the games of Lady Te-arei-n-Tarawa, who is their queen. Na-ikamawa now hears about these games and he wishes to go there in order to play with her. None of his friends from his village accompany him because Na-ikamawa wishes no rival with him. He arrives at the isthmus and sees Nā-ibunaki sitting under this shelter, the *ren*-tree, and he calls to him, "Nā-ibunaki, you get ready, and we'll go to watch the games in the village north of here." Nā-ibunaki says, "Maybe I'd better not accompany you because I am sick and I am unclean." Na-ikamawa says, "Don't play but instead sit down idly watching and waiting for me, and then when it's nearly dark we'll come back again." He is heavy-hearted but his mother, Nei Baka-torotoro, says to him, "You go along." And so then he did go along.

They traveled, and the lightning preceded them, only one, assuredly the lightning of the one who is Na-ikamawa, to exhibit his beauty. That lightning is seen by the people of the games and it affirms that Na-ikamawa is going to arrive at their games. Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa is happy. She mounts the swing and she tells the people to swing her in front of Na-ikamawa. When they arrive they at first watch but Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa calls to Na-ikamawa to swing her.

Na-ikamawa goes to swing her, and she says to Na-ikamawa, "Now why do you have the diseased one, Nā-ibunaki, come here?" And Na-ikamawa says to her, "It's all right because he's far away from your swing." Nā-ibunaki certainly hears that Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa dislikes him, for he lifts up his seat, a rock, and he puts it at a distance from the swing.

When night falls, Na-ikamawa calls to Nā-ibunaki that they are going to leave, to return to their places, and they arrive again at their places. Nā-ibunaki stays under the *ren*-tree which is his place and Na-

ikamawa goes to his village. But he tells Nā-ibunaki that they shall return again the next morning.

Nā-ibunaki tells his mother how Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa hates him, and his mother says to him, "You'll go along anyway when Na-ikamawa calls for you tomorrow. Do not play but sit down again on the stone where you sat."

When it is morning Na-ikamawa again arrives, and they again travel together. The lightning is also the same, only one preceding them, and the people of the games again know that Na-ikamawa is arriving, and Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa again makes preparations for the games before Na-ikamawa [comes]. They stand up and play *oreano* and *ikatokatoka* [a circle of male and female players keep a light ball aloft with their hands or other parts of the body].

When they arrive, Na-ikamawa is called to play *oreano* and *ikatokatoka*, and Nā-ibunaki again returns to his place, the stone, to sit down on it. And the ball falls beside Nā-ibunaki, and Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa speaks thus: "See my ball! Did it touch Nā-ibunaki or not?" And they reply, "It is really very far from him." She again speaks: "Watch my ball! Because if it touches that one you shall burn it because his sickness which is very great is an unclean sickness." And Nā-ibunaki certainly hears Te-arei-n-Tarawa's words, and he is much shamed in people's eyes. And when it is nearly dark Na-ikamawa again says to Nā-ibunaki, "It is dark so we shall go." Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa tells him that they should return again the next day.

And Nā-ibunaki stays at his place and Na-ikamawa goes to his place. Nā-ibunaki again tells his mother he is not going to go back, not going to accompany Na-ikamawa when he arrives the next morning because he is greatly ashamed on account of having heard Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa's conversation about how unclean her ball would be if it touched his body.

Nei Baka-torotoro opens her door and speaks with the people of the village in Mōne. Several men arrive, and they lead Nā-ibunaki away to get ready to remove his sickness. When it is, perhaps, nearly dawn they again carry him to his place under the *ren*-tree, and his mother sees him as the best of her children, and she says to him, "Now at last you are all right! Surely no one is more handsome than you! And when Na-ikamawa again escorts you to the games don't go to her but again go and sit down on your seat, the rock, where you stay and stay until you come back next. Now, don't join the games yet."

And when it is again morning and Na-ikamawa again arrives, he calls Nā-ibunaki as usual, and they again travel together, those two, and the

lightning again precedes them. The people of the games wonder because, yes, there are two lightnings arriving in their midst. And the brilliance of one lightning is mightier than the other. They certainly know that the lightning with the mightier brilliance has newly arrived because they are not at all familiar with that lightning. The lightning with the weaker brilliance they well know as the lightning of Na-ikamawa. They say, "Who is the man who is more handsome than Na-ikamawa?" Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa is happy about it and she prepares for her games before the men will have arrived.

When they arrive Nā-ibunaki is seen as the man who has the finest, the most brilliant, appearance. He goes as usual to frequent his spot, the rock that he sits down on, and Na-ikamawa goes to the games. When Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa sees him sitting down on the rock she says to him, "Nā-ibunaki, come here and swing me!" And Nā-ibunaki, referring to his skin disease, says, "I refuse to let your swing be soiled by me." Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa again speaks and she says, "If you don't swing me I'll get down from my swing!" Nā-ibunaki says, "Don't get down from your swing because Na-ikamawa will certainly swing and swing you. You well know that my sickness is much too unclean!"

Well, when Nā-ibunaki will not come, Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa hastily comes down from her swing, and she takes the ball, and she throws it to Nā-ibunaki. When the ball falls beside him—by Nā-ibunaki—he gets the striking stick for that ball there beside him because he does not wish to grasp it with his hand on account of his refusing to soil the ball with his hands. Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa says to Sir Nā-ibunaki, "Don't strike it with the stick. Give it a push with your hand instead. Then you come here for us to *ikatokatoka* because I expect you now, and you hurry up!"

She finishes her command to Nā-ibunaki, and he says, "I really am unable to participate as I wish to leave for my place ahead of Na-ikamawa's departure. I wish to sleep on account of my sickness; my skin disease hurts so I'm going to go and Na-ikamawa can go later." And when he stands up and is going to leave, Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa leaves the game and begins to accompany Nā-ibunaki. However, Nā-ibunaki leaves her behind because he grieves about his sickness and poverty because there are no food trees on his land and no house in which she could rest comfortably. Te-arei-n-Tarawa says, "It does not matter because I shall share your pitiful condition, but don't leave me behind because I do love you, and I assure you that I cannot forget my wrong. That you well know. So I shall accompany you as your slave."

When it is seen that Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa is accompanying Nā-

ibunaki, her kinfolk (*utu*) arrive to seize her, and they say, "Woman! You stay away from this man because you will die piteously, for they have no food and no place to live. Their only place to live is under the *ren*-tree." That woman says, "All right! But don't prolong your remarks because I am going!" And those people join her again, and they say, "Goodbye! But we give you our word. We shall indeed go later when you suffer from hunger and we shall bring your food—fruits of the *non*-tree [*Morinda citrifolia*, Indian mulberry, a famine food]—because Nā-ibunaki and his mother are not accustomed to eat *babai* and *kabubu* [pandanus flour] because their food consists of the fruits of the *non* when they hunt for it."

Nei Baka-torotoro turns to the north and sees her child, and he has a companion, a woman. She speaks to Mōne to carry to her the food that is directly from the fire, and it has already reached her when her child arrives. They sit down under the *ren*-tree, and Nei Baka-torotoro is very happy with Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa. She hastens to lift up before their eyes her food to eat. And when Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa sees so much good food she speaks to her husband, and says, "Where does this food come from?" Nā-ibunaki says to her, "Nei Baka-torotoro happens to find it in the sea. Perhaps they are leftovers of Na-ikamawa's food which has been thrown away, or perhaps it has floated away and has stranded near our land." That woman says, "That is not how these things were happened on! Really these things have just now been palatably prepared."

They have stayed at Nā-ibunaki's place now, maybe about two days. Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa's clan (*utu*) decides to follow her because it would be pitiful for her to die of hunger with Nā-ibunaki since they have no food. Her whole *utu* assembles but first they go and get the *non* to bring to Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa. After finishing getting the *non* fruits, they launch their canoes and sail straight to Nā-ibunaki's place.

Nei Baka-torotoro sees the canoes making straight for her land and already knows that they are the canoes of Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa's village. Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa is asleep at this time. Nei Baka-torotoro again speaks and tells the people of Mōne to bring up a finished, well-made house because the people who are arriving are to live in it, and they shall also bring many foods—*babai* with fish, and toddy molasses as well as *tuae* [a tasty pandanus preserve], *kabubu*, drinking nuts. And a beautiful house is speedily erected, and there is much food inside of it, with each food gathered together in a certain place; and it is to be dedicated from end to end as the place for the people arriving.

Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa awakens from sleep and sees everything. Behold! She sees the great and beautiful house, and she goes there to view it and sees much food in that house. She certainly wonders at the extremely great amount of it and where it came from.

After a while Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa's canoes arrive, and Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa is the first to go down to the beach. They see her as she goes down and they shout from their canoes: "Hurry, you, come here! How are you? Are you alive or are you dead?" And she herself says to them, "What is your cargo that's in those leafy wrappings of yours?" And they say, "Fruits of the *non*! But call your husband to help lift them for these packages are extremely large."

Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa replies to them, "You will cause much shame by this food of yours. Quickly dump it in the sea. The household has yet to see them. They have yet to eat fruits of the *non*, from my first coming to them until now because we eat *babai* and *tuae*, *kabubu*, and fish, toddy molasses and drinking nuts. Yes, these are the foods for their nourishment. Come along here now, and you'll soon see a house that is like a village assembly house (*maneaba*) that has been prepared and completed on your behalf, for you are to stay there now. Soon you will see a surpassing amount of food that is gathered in one place. As soon as you see these things you will be ashamed as a result, and then your hearts will be sad at your insults to them in bringing here the fruits of the *non* for them, truly a bad food that is food for birds and *makauro*-crabs. Yet you yourselves bring it as canoe cargo, as food for Nei Baka-torotoro and Nā-ibunaki! The *non* must be discarded and prevented from being brought ashore!"

The people of these canoes say to each other, "We beg of you that you not bring these things as they are bad." And she says, "We are happy to eat food like the *non* as it is not a delicacy of ours! Most of our delicacies consist of food which has drifted away and we discover on the beach, and so we have just good foods."

And when they go ashore, they enter that house and see much food—good things!—on which they are to feast. Nā-ibunaki and his mother give them their food and the two eat with them.

After three days have passed they wish to return to their place, and when it is time, Nei Baka-torotoro again commands that food be brought to her as food for the voyages of these people to their land. It arrives: the *katī* and the *kabā*, the *tangana*, the *buatoro*, the *korokoro*, the *ririniman*, the *kamaimai*, and the *kaben*. The story says that when they have finished loading the cargo on their canoes they were

swamped! That place is known as the Tebonoua [The Swamping]. Its meaning: Shaming of the proud and the lofty. Amen.

Katharine Luomala
University of Hawaii

NOTES

1. I gratefully acknowledge support in my Gilbertese studies from the University of Hawaii, the Bernice P. Bishop Museum, the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, the Guggenheim Foundation, the National Science Foundation, and the Smithsonian Institution. I also wish to thank Professor emeritus H. E. Maude for a copy of the Simmons and some of the Grimble manuscripts, and The Institute for Polynesian Studies at Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus for typing and other assistance.

2. It is not known exactly when Ten (Mr.) Tirora of Buariki, Tarawa, wrote down this and other stories for Miss Beatrice Emmeline Simmons, a London Missionary Society trained nurse and teacher, with headquarters in Beru, between 1910 and 1936. For other of Tirora's stories, see Luomala 1965:31–33, "The Women's Forehandedness"; 1975:258–260, "Lady Cat and Lady Rat"; 1980:231–233, "Stories about Na Areau and Tabuariki"; 1981:232, "Nei Uè and Rabono" (abstract only). I have translated these stories into English from Gilbertese.

3. To some degree this folktale illustrates some of folklorist Axel Olrik's "epic laws of folk narrative" (1965). Stated informally, as applied here, they are: low-key openings and endings (for each of the three parts); use of the number three, particularly in repeating scenes for emphasis (Te-boka-marawa's pursuit; visits to the games); series of tableaux scenes with only two characters active in a scene, and if more than one has the same role he counts as one (clan; two brothers named Na-ikamawa); and the two characters contrast in some way (strong and weak, good and bad, rich and poor, ugly and handsome, old and young, high and low). Also the story has a single-thread development (no subplots) and if new information about the past is needed it comes mainly in dialogue (and in musings by Nā-ibunaki and his wife). The story sticks pretty well to providing details essential to bring about an event implied earlier without giving the story away. Further, the story concentrates on the leading character (but Nā-ibunaki appears only indirectly in Part 3; maybe his mother is the leading character after all). When a man and a woman appear in a scene together, the man is more important but the woman is more interesting (the women, Baka-torotoro and Te-arei-n-Tarawa, are indeed scene-stealers). One inapplicable "law" is that the principal person is named first in a series but the last arouses sympathy (Nā-ibunaki, the principal character, is the first-born son who at least arouses one's initial sympathy).

4. The hero's father is Te-boka-marawa, a god who deceives people. He manifests himself to those fishing by torchlight from canoes (*tatae*) as either a blazing light or a phantom canoe of *tatae* fisherman, and leads them far out to sea and death. His false torch leads people fishing with torches on the reef (*kibe*) to fall into deep crevasses (Luomala 1980:554). Sabatier (1954:840–841) divides the name as Te-boka-marawa, which may then mean, I suggest, The Ocean-Vitiator (or Spoiler). *Marawa* is the ocean; *te boka* refers

to spoiling, vitiating, decomposing, and, figuratively, to slackness and lack of effectiveness. *Teboka*, on the other hand, when applied to a fisherman's ritual, refers to his sprinkling himself or being sprinkled to purify himself, mark his transition from ocean to land, and ensure future good luck (Luomala 1980:530, 551).

Nā-ibunaki and Na-ikamawa are to Bingham (1908:47) "false gods." To Sabatier (1954:840–841) they are mythical demigods, and Nei (Lady) Baka-torotoro is Nā-ibunaki's wife. In Tirora's story she is his mother. I have not come across Baka-torotoro's name other than in Sabatier's dictionary and Tirora's story. Tirora explains later that she is Queen of Mōne (Underworld). Part of Mōne is under the sea, but Baka-torotoro's domain seems limited to that under the island.

Tirora does not explain Nā-ibunaki's name, but figuratively interprets the name Na-ikamawa as "the beautiful and the best one." An *ikamāwa* is an unidentified, glossy, green fish, eaten raw (A. Grimble 1933:26; Sabatier 1954:268). Perhaps Na-ikamawa was considered as nice-looking as this fish. Baka-torotoro and Te-boka-marawa are said to have had a third son, perhaps also named Na-ikamawa. No more is heard of him; the narrator has consolidated him with the handsome second son of that name to contrast with the ugly first-born. The name Bebeti (Rubbish) seems purely descriptive for the first son, although Bingham (1908:69) lists Bebeti as the name of a god. Sabatier lists Bebeti and Bebeta as names of "*anti* (*esprits*)" and "Bebeti-Bebeta" as the name of an undescribed game in which one player is Bebeti, the other Bebeta (1954:149).

5. Grimble Papers, from Mareko, a man of Taboiaki, Beru; R. Grimble 1972:105–106. Parkinson (1889:102–103) says the evil Tina-tau-te-koka keeps back the rain and sends storms to wreck canoes; no one worships her but seeks protection through Tabu-ariki, the principal god.

6. Grimble Papers, from Anetipa, a Nui man, in 1921; R. Grimble 1972:52–55.

7. The thirty-eight-year-old Anetipa traced descent from Nei Te-arei-n-Tarawa and Taburimai; their descendants moved from Tarawa to Nonouti, but around 1650 A.D. during the invasion from Beru of Kaitu and his magician Uakeia, they fled to Nui. I find no interpretation of the name Te-arei-n-Tarawa; if it were Te-arēi (long *e*), it might be freely interpreted as The Madcap of Tarawa, as *arēi* means heedless, carefree, weathervane.

8. Grimble Papers, source not given; R. Grimble 1972:96–100.

9. Luomala 1948, Tabiteuea Field Notes, from the Benuākura clan tradition, Kabuibui village. Grimble Papers, from an unnamed source, have two summaries of events up to Aro-matang's death when his feathers became part of Benuākura's canoe flag. A. Grimble 1921b:81, 82, Fig.1, contains a sketch and reference to the canoe crest. Not all bird-children are rejected by their parents. A Banaba myth in the Grimble Papers is about a woman who bore a black noddy, Te-kunei, who caught fish for her; also R. Grimble 1972:47.

10. On traditional marriages: Parkinson 1889:37–39; A. Grimble 1921a:26–34; Luomala 1950, *Arorae Informants' Manuscripts*. Example of a modern marriage: Lundsgaarde 1974:206–210.

11. Luomala 1948, Tabiteuea Field Notes; A. Grimble 1921a:41–44.

12. Colcord n.d.; Parkinson 1889:34; Krämer 1906:284–285; Luomala 1948, Tabiteuea Field Notes.

13. Luomala 1948, Tabiteuea Field Notes, in a family history and genealogy from Roteman, a Tekaman village man. Grimble Papers, from Nei Okobeta, Banaba, have a variant in which Nei Ni-karawa, daughter of a sky man and an earthly woman, falls from a broken tree branch in Karawa (Heaven) into a garfish (*make*) pond, takes the name Komake, and marries Na Utonga; also in R. Grimble 1972:149–150. From an unnamed source, Grimble Papers tell of a superbly beautiful girl, Nei Naobatia, who loves games and has a swing called Te Iti and Te Areau, The Lightning and The Splendour. When Na Tanoititi slipped and fell to his death while pushing her, she magically restored him to life.
14. Grimble Papers from two men, Nauoko of Tarawa and Toakai of Maiana.
15. Luomala 1948, Tabiteuea Field Notes, from Roteman's family history and genealogy.
16. Pateman 1942:45 from Beru. Luomala 1948, Tabiteuea Field Notes: a variant from Ten Are, Buariki village, mentions the giants playing with Teweia but not the names of the games.
17. Luomala 1948, Tabiteuea Field Notes, from Benuākura clan tradition, Kabuibui village.
18. A. Grimble 1931:203–204; R. Grimble 1972:117–118.
19. These festive cooked foods differ as to name and recipe from island to island and over time. Corms of *babai* (*Cyrtosperma chamissonis*) are usually reserved for celebrations. Two *babai*-based puddings named in the story are *buatoro* and *tangana*; three pandanus-based puddings are *katī*, *kabā*, and *rīrīnīman*. The pandanus used is in the form of *kabubu* and *tuae*, also mentioned in the story. *Kabubu* is a coarse-textured, long-lasting flour pounded from sunbaked, previously cooked and mashed pandanus keys. *Tuae* is a sticky, sweet preserve made from the cooked and mashed, juicy ends of pandanus keys, spread out like *kabubu* in rectangles to sunbake, and then cut into pieces for puddings. *Korokoro* is a pandanus-based relish, *kaben* a coconut-based relish. Coconut ingredients added to puddings before or after the base has been cooked include coconut water, coconut cream, fresh toddy, toddy cooked once into syrup, toddy cooked twice into molasses (*kamaimai*). Toddlies also serve as beverages. A. Grimble 1933:34ff.; Catala 1957:56–58, 74–75; Luomala 1948, Tabiteuea Field Notes.
20. Tirora's Gilbertese text: “. . . te Tebonoua. Nanona: Kamamaean te kainikatonga ma te kariatāta. Amene.” *Te Tebonoua* means “The Swamping” and “The Overwhelming,” *Tekainikatonga* and *te kariatāta* are synonyms. Tirora ends with “Amen” but usually he likes to add a moral or a Biblical interpretation. Perhaps he was unfamiliar with the proverb “Pride goeth before a fall” to apply to the haughty clan of Te-arei-n-Tarawa.
21. Parkinson 1889:37–39; Luomala 1950, Arorae Informant's Manuscripts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bingham, Hiram
 1908 *A Gilbertese-English Dictionary*. Boston: American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.
- Catala, René, L. A.
 1957 “Report on the Gilbert Islands: Some Aspects of Human Ecology.” *Atoll Research*

Bull. 59. The Pacific Science Board, Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council.

Colcord, Joanna C., ed.

- n.d. *Journal of Mrs. Andrew D. Colcord Aboard the Missionary Brig Morning Star on a Voyage to Micronesia, 1875*. Typescript in Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu.

Grimble, Arthur

- 1921a "From Birth to Death in the Gilbert Islands." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 51:25–54.
 1921b "Canoe Crests of the Gilbert Islanders." *Man* 21:81–85.
 1931 "Gilbertese Astronomy and Astronomical Observations." *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 40: 197–224.
 1933 "The Migrations of a Pandanus People." *Mem. Supp. 12, Journal of the Polynesian Society* 42:1–50.
 n.d. The Grimble Papers: Gilbertese Myths, Legends, and Oral Traditions. Collected by (Sir) Arthur Grimble between c. 1916 and 1930. Department of Pacific History, Australian National University, Canberra.

Grimble, Rosemary, ed.

- 1972 *Migrations, Myth and Magic from the Gilbert Islands. Early Writings of Sir Arthur Grimble*. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Krämer, Augustin

- 1906 *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa*. Stuttgart: Strecker & Schröder.

Lundsgaarde, Henry P.

- 1974 "The Evolution of Tenure Principles on Tamana Island, Gilbert Islands." In Henry P. Lundsgaarde, ed., *Land Tenure in Oceania*. Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania Monograph 2:179–214. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Luomala, Katharine

- 1948 Tabiteuean Field Notes.
 1950 Arorae Informants' Manuscripts.
 1965 "Humorous Narratives about Individual Resistance to Food-Distribution Customs in Tabiteuea, Gilbert Islands." *Journal of American Folklore* 78:28–45.
 1975 "Cultural Associations of Land Mammals in the Gilbert Islands." *Bernice P. Bishop Museum Occasional Papers* 24(13):227–274.
 1980 "Some Fishing Customs and Beliefs in Tabiteuea (Gilbert Islands, Micronesia)." *Anthropos* 75:523–558.
 1981 "Eels in Gilbert Islands Culture: Traditional Beliefs, Rituals and Narratives." *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* 37:227–237.

Olrik, Axel

- 1965 "Epic Laws of Folk Narrative." In Alan Dundes, ed., *The Study of Folklore*, pp. 129–141. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall. Translated by Jeanne P. Steager from "Epische Gesetze der Volkdichtung," *Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum und Deutsches Literatur* 51 (1909):1–12.

Parkinson, R.

- 1889 "Beiträge zur Ethnologie der Gilbert-Insulaner." *Internationales Archiv für Ethnologie* 2:31–48, 90–106.

Pateman, May, ed.

- 1942 *Aia Karakia Nikawai I-Tungaru (Myths and Legends of the Gilbertese People)*.
Beru, Gilbert Islands.

Sabatier, Révérend Père [E.]

- 1954 *Dictionnaire Gilbertin-Français*. Tabuiroa, Gilberts.

Tirora

- n.d. Stories in the Beatrice Emmeline Simmons Papers. Unpublished manuscript.

**TIME-EXPIRED MELANESIAN LABOR IN QUEENSLAND:
AN INVESTIGATION OF JOB TURNOVER
1884-1906**

by Ralph Shlomowitz

Introduction

During the past two decades there has been an outpouring of research on the experience of the Melanesian community in Queensland. Much of this research effort was first made toward doctoral dissertations and has concentrated on social, cultural, and political issues using literary and oral sources (see citations to the works of Corris, Graves, Mercer, Moore, Parnaby, Saunders, and Scarr in the Bibliography). The present author has attempted to contribute to this research effort by widening the scope of the research program to include economic issues and by widening the bodies of evidence used to include quantitative evidence (see citations to my work in the Bibliography).

Many contemporary observers and some later historians have argued that Melanesians were forceably brought to Queensland as agricultural laborers, were coerced to work on sugarcane plantations under exploitative conditions, and lived in an economically dependent and socially and politically subordinate relationship to the white majority. White racism appears as the principal explanation for their oppression.

The thrust of recent scholarship, however, has been to dispute significant aspects of this viewpoint. It has been argued that the vast majority of Melanesians were not forced into coming to Queensland, that the degree of coercion of Melanesian labor on sugarcane plantations has been exaggerated, and that the attempt to depict the sugarcane growing

region of Queensland as one vast jail is an error. Although acknowledging that racial discrimination was very much a part of Queensland life, it has been persuasively argued that the Melanesians had considerably more power than was previously thought.

Power relations between white Queenslanders and Melanesian laborers had, of course, many dimensions. One important dimension related to economic matters such as the choices and opportunities open to Melanesians in the labor market. Much of recent scholarship has emphasized that Melanesians learned the ways in which the market for their labor afforded them opportunities and were able to use this marketplace to further their economic and social interests.

This paper will attempt to contribute to the debate on the nature of the options open to Melanesians and how these options were used by investigating the job-change behavior of those Melanesians who had completed their initial contacts of indenture and opted to remain on in Queensland as time-expired workers. Estimates of job change will be provided and the determinants of job-change behavior will be investigated.

The paper commences with some background material on the structure and operation of markets for Melanesian labor in Queensland.

Melanesian Labor in Queensland

From its beginning in 1863 through the rest of the nineteenth century, the sugarcane industry in Queensland was reliant on the procurement of Melanesian labor under the indenture system. The main recruiting areas were the New Hebrides and the Solomon Islands. Beginning in the 1880s, smaller groups of Chinese, Cingalese, Japanese, Javanese, and Malays were also recruited to supplement the supply of Melanesian labor. The enactment of the "White Australia Policy" by the newly federated Commonwealth government of Australia in 1901 resulted in the phasing out of the use of Melanesian and Asian labor. The recruiting trade in Melanesian labor came to an end in 1904, and, allowing for certain exemptions, the Melanesian community in Queensland was repatriated during and soon after 1906.

During the period 1868–1906, the Queensland government explicitly regulated the procurement and employment of Melanesian labor under the indenture system. Recruits served for three years in Queensland and in return for their labor they received passage to and from Queensland, a wage of at least £6 per annum, and various payments in kind such as shelter, clothing, food, tobacco, and medical care. It was only from

1884 that the Queensland government also explicitly regulated the employment of those Melanesians who opted to stay on in Queensland at the end of their indenture contracts. These Melanesians were called "time-expired" workers. Time-expired labor contracts had to be entered before, and registered with, the Department of Immigration. The minimum and maximum lengths of labor contracts were specified as one month (increased in 1896 to six months) and three years, respectively, and their employment was constrained by the same minimum wage rate and by the receipt of the same payments in kind as their indentured counterparts.

Before 1880 there were no occupational restrictions on the employment of Melanesians in Queensland, and Melanesians were employed in sugarcane farming and milling, in the pastoral sector and in the towns. In 1880, 1884, and 1892 a series of discriminatory labor market legislation was enacted: in 1880, indentured Melanesians were restricted to employment in the sugarcane industry; in 1884 both indentured and time-expired Melanesians were restricted to *unskilled* jobs in the sugarcane industry; and in 1892 both indentured and time-expired Melanesians were precluded from working in the sugarcane mills. Time-expired Melanesians who had arrived in Queensland before 1880 were exempt from these occupational restrictions, and they received a certificate to that effect. The possessors of these certificates or tickets were called "ticket-holders," and they were not required to enter labor contracts before, and registered with, the Department of Immigration.

After 1884, accordingly, the Melanesian population in Queensland was divided into three legal categories: those who were under indenture; those who had completed their indentures and held certificates exempting them from having to register their employment contracts with the Department of Immigration; and those who had completed their indentures and had to have their employment contracts registered with the Department of Immigration. The proportions of these three legal classes in the Melanesian population fluctuated considerably: between 1884 and 1906 the proportion of ticket-holders in the Melanesian population fluctuated within the range 0.07–0.11 (Shlomowitz 1981a:73) while between 1888 and 1904 the proportion of islanders who had completed their indentures but did not hold such tickets fluctuated within the range 0.31–0.67 (see Table 1).

The legal requirement that the contracts of those time-expired Melanesians who did not hold exemption tickets were to be registered with the Department of Immigration and the fortunate survival of this documentation for the districts of Maryborough and Port Douglas provide a

TABLE 1 Time-Expired Melanesians as Proportion of Total Melanesian Population in Queensland, 1888–1904

Year	Total Melanesian Population in Queensland ^a	Time-Expired Melanesian Population in Queensland ^b	Time-Expireds as Proportion of Melanesian Population ^c
1888	8,200	2,449	0.31
1889	7,580	2,469	0.31
1890	8,115	2,760	0.32
1891	9,362	2,964	0.33
1892	8,627	2,935	0.35
1893	7,979	3,988	0.52
1894	7,489	5,139	0.67
1895	7,853	4,979	0.62
1896	8,163	4,773	0.57
1897	8,444	4,916	0.59
1898	8,224	5,342	0.64
1899	8,485	5,024	0.58
1900	8,795	4,131	0.46
1901	9,324	3,996	0.42
1902	9,841	3,569	0.38
1903	8,878	2,781	0.32
1904	8,614	3,205	0.39

Source: Annual Reports of the Department of Pacific Island Immigration, published in *Queensland Votes and Proceedings*.

^aData relate to the population at the beginning of each year.

^bData relate to the number of time-expired employment contracts entered into before the Department of Immigration each year.

^cTo calculate this proportion, the number of time-expired employment contracts entered into before the Department of Immigration was divided by an estimate of population in mid-year (which was taken as the average of the population at the beginning and at the end of the year).

unique body of evidence for studying the working of the market for time-expired Melanesians. This material consists of memoranda of agreements for Maryborough and registers of agreements for both Maryborough and Port Douglas.¹ Memoranda of agreements refer to the actual labor contracts entered into by employers and time-expired Melanesians; registers of agreements refer to volumes in which information from these labor contracts was transcribed by government officials in charge of supervising the employment of Melanesians in Queensland. For Maryborough, the memoranda and registers of agreements contain information on 1,940 and 4,067 labor contracts entered into during the

periods 1886–1906 and 1884–1905, respectively; for Port Douglas, the registers of agreements contain information on 2,185 labor contracts entered into during the period 1894–1906. The registers for Maryborough and Port Douglas contain data on what appear to be the complete set of labor contracts that were entered into and registered in those districts, while the memoranda from Maryborough form an important subset of this original set.

A quantitative analysis of the information in the registers of agreements on male time-expireds, who made up about 95% of the time-expired population, has been reported elsewhere (Shlomowitz 1981a: 83–91; 1982b:350–55). The main findings of this analysis can be briefly summarized. First, the length of employment contracts had the following distribution: under 12 months, 55.4%; 12 months, 34.3%; over 12 months, 10.3% (see Table 2). The most popular durations, which accounted for 65% of all contracts, were for 6 and 12 months. Most of the 6-month contracts were to meet the labor requirements of the cane-cutting season (see Table 3).

Second, in contrast to the depressed state of the overall Australian economy, the Queensland sugarcane industry expanded rapidly in the 1890s, and this was associated with an increasing demand for time-expired Melanesian labor, forcing up their wage rates. Their average annual (or annual-equivalent) wage increased from £18 (1884) to £23 (1901) and from £18 (1894) to £35 (1904) in Maryborough and Port Douglas, respectively (see Table 4).

Third, there was in any one year a marked dispersion in wage rates in both Maryborough and Port Douglas (see Table 4). This dispersion can be explained, in part, by a number of socioeconomic factors. It has been found, for example, that, other things remaining the same, higher wages were received by the more experienced, by those who were recruited in the Solomon Islands as compared to the New Hebrides, and by those who worked for small-scale farmers as compared to large-scale planters (Shlomowitz 1982b:354–55).

The shape of the distribution of wage rates in any one year and changes in the average level of wage rates over time provide strong evidence that whatever employer intent, they were unable to impose a uniform level of wages or a ceiling to their wage offers, at least in Maryborough and Port Douglas. A variety of other direct and indirect evidence provides further support for the proposition that the market for time-expired Melanesian labor was significantly open to the influence of market forces (Shlomowitz 1981a:83–86).

TABLE 2 Distribution of Length of Employment Contracts of Male Time-Expired Melanesians, 1884-1906.

District and Year	Number of Observations	Average Length of Contracts (months)	Distribution of Length of Contracts		
			Under 12 months %	12 months %	Over 12 months %
Maryborough					
1884	48	20.1	0	54	46
1885	118	9.3	48	50	2
1886	245	9.8	46	49	6
1887	117	8.9	60	39	1
1888	84	10.0	43	55	2
1889	107	11.4	20	75	6
1890	163	12.0	26	62	12
1891	203	12.6	22	46	32
1892	265	11.9	38	36	26
1893	394	7.7	68	29	4
1894	750	7.7	74	22	4
1895	725	7.1	80	20	0
1896	154	8.3	70	28	3
1897	123	8.5	64	34	2
1898	141	8.8	60	37	4
1899	110	9.2	56	41	3
1900	82	9.2	56	41	2
1901	38	8.6	61	39	0
Total	3,867				
Port Douglas					
1894	10	14.1	40	20	40
1895	38	9.8	53	42	5
1896	77	9.2	52	44	4
1897	244	10.1	57	35	7
1898	197	9.3	59	38	3
1899	140	9.1	71	26	4
1900	136	9.5	66	29	4
1901	170	10.0	56	40	4
1902	241	10.8	59	26	15
1903	203	12.6	57	23	20
1904	316	15.3	11	51	37
1905	296	13.4	21	40	39
1906	115	9.8	95	5	—
Total	2,183				

Sources: Register of Agreements entered into for the Employment of Pacific Islanders, 1884-1901, Inspector of Pacific Islanders, Maryborough District, Queensland State Archives, I.P.I. 3/8-9; Register of Agreements entered into by Polynesian Labourers, 1894-1906, Inspector of Pacific Islanders, Port Douglas District, Queensland State Archives, I.P.I. 12/1.

TABLE 3 Distribution of Employment Contracts of Less Than Twelve Months of Male Time-Expired Melanesians, 1885-1906 (percent)

District and Year	Distribution by Contract Length ^a			Distribution by Seasonal Contract ^b	
	2-5 months	6 months	7-11 months	High season	Low season
Maryborough					
1885	17	58	25	67	33
1886	26	54	20	70	30
1887	20	34	46	86	14
1888	28	5	67	86	14
1889	—	71	29	86	14
1890	29	29	43	100	—
1891	13	67	20	58	42
1892	37	55	8	68	32
1893	24	74	2	77	23
1894	26	58	16	72	28
1895	26	52	22	69	31
1896	8	75	17	62	38
1897	3	86	11	65	35
1898	2	86	12	57	43
1899	2	82	16	68	32
1900	2	76	22	80	20
1901	—	87	13	83	17
Port Douglas					
1894	25	75	—	75	25
1895	5	85	10	65	35
1896	—	100	—	65	35
1897	1	31	68	86	14
1898	1	50	49	78	22
1899	—	49	52	89	11
1900	—	56	44	77	23
1901	—	32	68	93	7
1902	1	70	29	80	20
1903	—	50	50	88	12
1904	—	67	33	83	17
1905	—	46	54	91	9
1906	1	9	90	99	1

Sources: See Table 2.

^aIn 1896, the Queensland government issued a directive prohibiting contracts of less than six months in length; this restriction did not apply to Melanesians who were waiting for a return voyage to their home islands.

^bThe high season related to the period of sugarcane harvesting and milling. This lasted from June to December; the low season, accordingly, was from January to May. For contracts that overlap these periods, allocation is made to the period in which the major portion of the overlap occurs.

TABLE 4 Annual Wage Rates of Male Time-Expired Melanesians, 1884–1906 (pounds)^a

District and Year	Number of Observations	Average	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation ^b
Maryborough				
1884	48	18.1	5.0	0.276
1885	118	22.5	5.1	0.227
1886	245	17.8	5.2	0.292
1887	117	18.1	4.9	0.271
1888	84	16.0	4.1	0.256
1889	107	16.3	3.5	0.215
1890	163	16.0	3.3	0.206
1891	203	18.6	4.6	0.247
1892	265	18.7	4.8	0.257
1893	394	20.2	3.6	0.178
1894	750	22.3	3.9	0.175
1895	725	23.8	3.2	0.134
1896	154	19.5	3.4	0.174
1897	123	18.7	3.1	0.166
1898	141	20.5	2.6	0.127
1899	110	23.0	3.8	0.165
1900	82	22.7	3.4	0.150
1901	38	22.6	3.6	0.159
Port Douglas				
1894	10	18.0	7.6	0.422
1895	38	22.5	4.8	0.215
1896	77	25.2	3.0	0.120
1897	244	21.8	2.9	0.134
1898	195	28.3	3.5	0.122
1899	140	29.2	3.8	0.129
1900	136	27.1	2.8	0.102
1901	170	26.9	1.9	0.069
1902	241	26.1	4.1	0.156
1903	203	25.1	4.3	0.172
1904	316	31.2	2.1	0.067
1905	296	35.3	3.0	0.086
1906	115	27.3	3.5	0.127

Sources: See Table 2.

^aWage rates for contracts of less than 12 months or more than 12 months have been converted to be on an annual basis.

^bThis is a measure of the dispersion of wage rates among time-expired Melanesians. It is derived by dividing the standard deviation by the average.

Turnover Estimates from Memoranda of Agreements

For the purpose of this paper, a job change relates to a change in both work location and employer. Accordingly, the transfer of a time-expired Melanesian to another plantation or farm owned by the same employer in the same district is not considered a job change; neither is a change in the Melanesian's employer brought about by a change in ownership of the property on which the Melanesian remained employed. It is also noted that only *intradistrict* job-change rates can be calculated from information in the memoranda and registers of agreements for the districts of Maryborough and Port Douglas; these will form the lower bounds on the "true" job-change rates, as job changes that came about through departures from the districts of Maryborough and Port Douglas are not captured in this body of evidence.

The measurement of job change can be made directly from the memoranda of agreements as each memorandum contains the names of the current, last, and first employer, where the first employer refers to the employer to whom the Melanesian was originally indentured.

A comparison of the names of the current and first employers shows that in only 218 of the 1,940 memoranda entered into in Maryborough did the Melanesian continue to work for the first employer. Of these 218 contracts, 181 were for Melanesians who had only worked for this employer while 37 were for Melanesians who had worked for at least one other employer before returning to the first employer.

The number of contracts that related to time-expired Melanesians who had only worked for one employer, 181, was derived from contracts where current, last, and first employers were the same. This is an estimate of the upper bound, as contracts with other employers could have been held between the last and the first employer.

It is also possible to calculate the proportion of Melanesians who, in each succeeding year following the completion of their indentures, continued to work for their first employer. During the first year after the completion of their indentures, this proportion was already only 39%, and it fell to 19% in the second year, and to 8% in the third year; by the ninth year it had fallen to 2%.

There are some fragments of literary evidence that give support to this quantitative finding that few Melanesians remained with their first employer. In 1898 a newspaper correspondent from the Wide Bay and Burnett district reported that "when a Kanaka has finished his time with the planter who brought him in he is free to engage again if he

likes; but, appreciating a change, he prefers to go to some other employer."² In 1905 an official of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company reported from the district of the Johnstone River, "As you are probably aware, Kanakas on the completion of their [indenture] agreements as a rule like a change of Masters, and seldom therefore reengage with the previous employer."³

The relatively low retention rate of first employers is understandable. Relatively few Melanesians had the opportunity to express a preference for a particular employer to whom they would be indentured. So it was to be expected that once their indenture was completed, they would want to seek out more preferred employers.

Information in the memoranda of agreements also makes it possible to estimate the job-change rate of Melanesians more generally between all their employment contracts. A comparison of the names of the current and last employers of the time-expired Melanesian shows that in only 660 of the 1,940 memoranda entered into in Maryborough did the time-expired Melanesian continue to work for the same employer in successive employment contracts. This yields a job turnover rate of 66%.

Literary evidence also supports this quantitative finding that time-expired Melanesians, in making new employment contracts, were more likely to change employers than stay with the same employer. In 1884 the police magistrate of Mackay, W. P. Goodall, reported that Melanesians were "constantly changing masters,"⁴ and in 1892 a sugarcane planter from Mackay, J. Ewen Davidson, in a letter to the editor of a newspaper, reported, "From their love of change islanders go from plantation to plantation, remaining say a year on each, and often returning to the employer they like best."⁵

What facilitated such job-change behavior was the relative ease with which job changes could be effected. Most of the Melanesians were young, without dependents, and had few possessions. Furthermore, these intradistrict moves did not involve traveling long distances.

It has been shown above that the memoranda of agreements, by including the name of the last employer in the current employment contract, have made it possible to compute job-change rates by simply comparing the names of the last and current employers. Unfortunately, however, the name of the last employer is the only information about the last employment contract that is included in the current contract. This constrains the usefulness of the memoranda of agreements as a body of evidence for investigating job-change behavior in three important respects. First, the absence of information in the current contract on the dates of the commencement and termination (and thus the dura-

tion) of the last contract makes it impossible to distinguish among job changes between annual contracts, between seasonal contracts, and between a seasonal and an annual contract. Second, the absence of information on the termination date of the last contract makes it impossible to distinguish job changes between contracts that followed one another without an interval and contracts that were separated by a period of voluntary or involuntary unemployment. Finally, the absence of information on the wage rate agreed to in the last contract makes it impossible to distinguish job changes that were associated with wage improvement from job changes that were not associated with wage improvement.

Turnover Estimates from Registers of Agreements

The above constraints can be overcome by using information in the registers of agreements to construct work histories of individual time-expired Melanesians and to compute job-change rates from these.

The following procedures have been adopted: First, the analysis is limited to job changes between pairs of successive twelve-month contracts; this avoids the problems of interpretation caused by the inclusion of seasonal contracts. For example, if a time-expired Melanesian worked for employer Smith during the harvesting season of 1884 (June to December), for employer Brown during the slack season of 1885 (January to May), and then returned to employer Smith for the harvesting season of 1885, his turnover behavior could be interpreted as either zero, one, or two job changes. Longer-term annual contracts (for twenty-four or thirty-six months) were also excluded as so few of these were entered into.

Second, the analysis allows for an interval of up to five months between pairs of successive twelve-month contracts provided that short-term contracts were not entered into in this interval.

From the work profiles, samples were obtained of 280 and 121 pairs of successive twelve-month contracts entered into by 192 and 81 male time-expired Melanesians for the districts of Maryborough and Port Douglas, respectively. In the combined sample, 90% of the pairs of successive twelve-month contracts were separated by two months or less.

Table 5 shows that, when the data is pooled for the whole period, 1885–1905, Melanesians changed jobs on 131 out of the 280 occasions in the sample for Maryborough and on 52 out of the 121 occasions in the sample for Port Douglas. This yields job-turnover rates of 47% and 43% for Maryborough and Port Douglas, respectively. It is noted that for the

TABLE 5 Job Turnover and Wage Improvement, 1885–1905, Using Data Pooled for Entire Period

Turnover Category	Maryborough		Port Douglas	
	Number of cases	Percentage of subtotal	Number of cases	Percentage of subtotal
Stayers				
Wage up	65	43.6	20	29.0
Wage same	67	45.0	48	69.6
Wage down	17	11.4	1	1.5
<i>Subtotal</i>	149	100.0	69	100.0
Changers				
Wage up	81	61.8	33	63.5
Wage same	13	10.0	12	23.1
Wage down	37	28.2	7	13.4
<i>Subtotal</i>	131	100.0	52	100.0
Total	280		121	

Sources: See Table 2.

district of Maryborough, the job-turnover rate calculated from the memoranda of agreements, 66%, is higher than the rate calculated from the registers of agreements, 47%. This is because the data used to calculate job-turnover rates from the memoranda of agreements, but not from the registers of agreements, contain an unknown number of seasonal contracts, and job-turnover rates between seasonal contracts were higher than those between annual contracts.

Besides noting the average job-turnover rate for pairs of successive twelve-month contracts, it is also of interest to inquire if some time-expired Melanesians remained for longer periods with the same employer. In the sample for the district of Maryborough, sixteen Melanesians had three successive twelve-month contracts with the same employer; one Melanesian had five successive twelve-month contracts with the same employer; one had seven successive twelve-month contracts; and one had eight such successive contracts. In the sample for Port Douglas, eight Melanesians had three successive twelve-month contracts with the same employer; six had four successive twelve-month contracts; and one had five such successive contracts.

The procedure for modeling the determinants of job change adopted in this paper is to compare the number of Melanesians who experienced an increase, a decrease, or no change in wages for the turnover categories "changers" (that is, those who changed jobs) and "stayers" (those who didn't change jobs).

The following are the more striking findings from the samples of 280 and 121 pairs of successive twelve-month contracts for the districts of Maryborough and Port Douglas. First, when data is pooled for the whole period, as shown in Table 5, wage improvement was experienced by a higher proportion of changers (61.8% for Maryborough and 63.5% for Port Douglas) than stayers (43.6% for Maryborough and 29.0% for Port Douglas). As the data on changers includes both quits (voluntary actions on the part of the Melanesians) and discharges and layoffs (over which the Melanesians may have had little control), and as discharges and layoffs are less likely than quits to be associated with wage improvement, it follows that the percentage of quits experiencing wage improvement was undoubtedly higher than the 61.8% and 63.5% reported above. The finding that wage improvement was experienced by a high proportion of changers, and that this proportion was higher for changers than stayers, suggests that most job changes were quits rather than discharges and layoffs and that pecuniary considerations were an important influence in the choice between jobs.

Second, these findings for the district of Maryborough are considerably more pronounced for the periods 1885–1890 and 1900–1905 than for the period 1891–1899. During 1885–1890 wage improvement was experienced by 66.7% of changers and only 29.5% of stayers; during 1891–1899, by 62.5% of changers and 61.5% of stayers; and during 1900–1905, by 47.1% of changers and 20.0% of stayers (see Table 6). There is no obvious explanation for the temporal variation in these statistics.

It is also possible to relate job turnover to the extent of the Melanesian's experience in Queensland's sugar industry. A proxy variable for such experience is the number of years between the date of arrival in Queensland and the date of signing the second of the pair of successive twelve-month contracts. This has to be at least four years from the date of arrival of the Melanesian in Queensland, as the first three years were spent under indenture.

Using this proxy variable for experience, a third finding is that the more experienced Melanesians were less likely to be changers: using combined data for Maryborough and Port Douglas pooled for the whole period, the probability of being a changer decreased from 0.56 in the category of less than seven years of experience, to 0.48 in the category of seven to thirteen years of experience, to 0.26 in the category of more than thirteen years of experience (see Table 7). One explanation for the high initial probability is that for the first few years after the completion of their indenture agreement, many Melanesians tried various jobs as a form of "job shopping"; that is, they may have believed that the

TABLE 6 Job Turnover and Wage Improvement, 1885-1905, Using Annual Data

District and Year	Stayers				Changers			
	Wage up	Wage same	Wage down	Sub- total	Wage up	Wage same	Wage down	Sub- total
Maryborough								
1885	1	2		3				
1886	1	6	1	8	1		2	3
1887	3	3	2	8	7		2	9
1888	2	3	2	7	1	1	3	5
1889	3	4	1	8	6	1	4	11
1890	3	7		10	13	1		14
1891	3	3		6	11	1	4	16
1892	8	6		14	5		5	10
1893	2	1	1	4	3	2	3	8
1894	3	2		5	11	2	3	16
1895	8	3		11	5	2	1	8
1896	2	2		4	1	1	1	3
1897	4	3	1	8				
1898	5	1		6	3			3
1899	5	2		7	6	1	1	8
1900	2	2	5	9	5		2	7
1901	1	5	1	7		1	3	4
1902	2		1	3			3	3
1903	1	7	2	10				
1904	5	3		8	2			2
1905	1	2		3	1			1
Port Douglas								
1895					1			1
1896	1	2		3				
1897	2	7	1	10	3		2	5
1898	4			4	7	3	1	11
1899	1	10		11	3	2		5
1900	1	6		7	1	2	2	5
1901	1	12		13	2	1		3
1902	2	4		6	3	2	1	6
1903		7		7		1	1	2
1904	5			5	3			3
1905	3			3	10	1		11

Sources: See Table 2.

TABLE 7 Job Turnover and Wage Improvement by Years of Experience, 1885-1905, Using Data Pooled for Entire Period

District and Years of Experience	Stayers				Changers			
	Wage up	Wage same	Wage down	Total	Wage up	Wage same	Wage down	Total
Maryborough								
4	9	7	1	17	19	1	8	28
5	6	14	2	22	11	2	7	20
6	5	11	4	20	13	3	7	23
7	7	3	3	13	8		4	12
8	6	7		13	7	2	2	11
9	6	4	1	11	2		1	3
10	3	6	1	10	6	1	1	8
11	4	1		5	4	1	1	6
12	1		1	2	2	2	2	6
13	2		1	3	2		1	3
14	2	1	1	7	2		1	3
15	3	2		5	1			1
16	4	2		6	1			1
17	2	3	1	6			1	1
18	3			3		1	1	2
19		2		2	1			1
20			1	1	1			1
21	1			1	1			1
22								
23		1		1				
24	1			1				
Port Douglas								
4		2		2	1	1		2
5		1		1	5			5
6	1	1		2	2		1	3
7	1			1	1	2	1	4
8	1	1		2	4	1		5
9	2	2		4	3			3
10	1	5		6	2	1		3
11	1	4		5	1	4	1	6
12		1	1	2	2	2	1	5
13	2	3		5	1		1	2
14	1	7		8	4			4
15	2	4		6			1	1
16	1	6		7	3			3

Continued

TABLE 7 Continued

District and Years of Experience	Stayers				Changers			
	Wage up	Wage same	Wage down	Total	Wage up	Wage same	Wage down	Total
17	1	4		5		1		1
18	2	5		7				
19	2	1		3	3		1	4
20	1	1		2				
24	1			1				
26					1			1

Sources: See Table 2.

only way they could acquire information about various jobs was to actually try them for a time.

A fourth finding is that, among both stayers and changers, the less experienced were more likely to suffer a wage decline: using combined data for Maryborough and Port Douglas pooled for the whole period, the probability of receiving a lower wage decreased from 0.19 in the category of less than nine years of experience to 0.11 in the category of nine or more years of experience (see Table 7). Unfortunately, it is not possible to identify the characteristics of changers who suffered a decline in wages. They could have been quits who traded preferred non-pecuniary amenities for wages or whose expectations in searching for higher wages had been disappointed, or they could have been layoffs and discharges.

To investigate whether job change was spatially dispersed or concentrated among clusters of employers within each district, Maryborough and Port Douglas, the employment changes of Melanesians need to be mapped. This involves obtaining information on the location of individual farm properties, the lessees of Crown Land, and, once this land was purchased, the owners of these farm properties. On the basis of a pilot survey at the Queensland State Archives and the Queensland Lands Office, it appears that there is insufficient information on lessees and owners of properties to perform such a "network" analysis.

Conclusion

This paper has been concerned with job change in the market for time-expired Melanesian labor in Queensland. The main findings of the paper are that at the conclusion of their indenture contracts Melane-

sians usually left the employer to whom they had been indentured and made frequent job changes thereafter;⁶ job change involved predominantly quits rather than layoffs or discharges; and, to an important extent, it was intended to take advantage of higher wages. This does not rule out the existence of other motives for job change, such as "job shopping," the seeking of preferred non-pecuniary amenities in other jobs, or the enjoyment of change for its own sake (the wanderlust that was mentioned by the literary sources cited above), but it does suggest that they might have been of secondary importance.

More generally, the results of this paper suggest that time-expired Melanesians had access to market information about offers in alternative jobs, and that they showed assertiveness in pursuing market-oriented goals. Thus, the evidence contained in this paper provides further support for the viewpoint developed elsewhere (Shlomowitz 1981a:91) that, within the legal structure that constrained their employment in Queensland, time-expired Melanesians participated fully in and obtained the benefits from the free market for their labor.

This paper has emphasized that Melanesians learned the requirements of marketplace economics rather quickly and that they were ever alert to opportunities for advancing their interests. The paper has also pointed out that legal barriers circumscribed the economic opportunities open to them; skilled jobs in sugarcane farming and non-farm jobs were closed to them. Accordingly, although they were "free" in the sense of not being bound to particular employers, their occupational mobility was constrained. They could only move within a political economy that offered them interchangeable jobs in the service of one producer of sugarcane or another.

Ralph Shlomowitz
Flinders University of South Australia

NOTES

This paper has resulted from an ongoing project, supported by the Australian Research Grants Committee, on Melanesian labor in Queensland. I am indebted to Beverley Vickers, Randall Fuller, and Eva Aker for research assistance, and to Stanley L. Engerman and participants of seminars at Australian National University, University of Connecticut, Dartmouth College, and Yale University for comments on an earlier version of this paper.

1. Memoranda and Registers of Agreements, Inspectors of Pacific Islanders, Queensland State Archives, IPI 3/5-9, 3/37, 12/1.

2. *Queenslander*, 21 May 1898, p. 984.

3. Coondi In, 23 June 1905, unpublished records of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, Archives of Business and Labour, Australian National University.
4. Colonial Secretary's Office, In-Letter 1659 of 1884, Queensland State Archives.
5. *Brisbane Courier*, 1 July 1892, p. 2.
6. For an English historical case study in which farm workers on annual contracts exhibited similarly high job-turnover rates, see Kussmaul 1981.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Corris, P.

- 1968 " 'Blackbirding' in New Guinea Waters, 1883-1884: An Episode in the Queensland Labour Trade." *Journal of Pacific History* 3:85-105.
- 1970 "Pacific Island Labour Migrants in Queensland." *Journal of Pacific History* 5:43-64.
- 1973 *Passage, Port and Plantation: A History of Solomon Island Labour Migration, 1870-1914*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Graves, A. A.

- 1979 Pacific Island Labour in the Queensland Sugar Industry, 1862-1906. Ph.D. Thesis, Oxford University.
- 1980 "The Abolition of the Queensland Labour Trade: Politics or Profits." In *Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism*, eds. E. L. Wheelwright and K. Buckley, vol. 4. Sydney: Australian and New Zealand Book Co.
- 1983 "Truck and Gifts: Melanesian Immigrants and the Trade Box System in Colonial Queensland." *Past and Present* 101:87-124.

Kussmaul, A. S.

- 1981 "The Ambiguous Mobility of Farm Servants." *Economic History Review* 34:222-35.

Mercer, P.

- 1981 Melanesians in North Queensland: A Study in Race Relations. Ph.D. Thesis, Australian National University.

Mercer, P., and C. R. Moore

- 1978 "Australia's Pacific Islanders 1906-1977." *Journal of Pacific History* 13:90-101.

Moore, C. R.

- 1981a Kanaka Maratta: A History of Melanesian Mackay. Ph.D. Thesis, James Cook University.
- 1981b "Kanaka, Kidnapping and Slavery: Myths from Nineteenth Century Labour Trade and Their Relevance to Australian Melanesians." *Kabar Seberang: Sulat-ing Maphilindo* 8-9:78-92.
- 1982 "Malaitan Recruiting to Queensland: An Oral History Approach." *Bikmaus* 3:57-71.

Moore, C. R., ed.

- 1979 *The Forgotten People: A History of the Australian South Sea Island Community*. Sydney: Australian Broadcasting Commission.

Moore, C. R., and P. M. Mercer

- 1976 "Melanesians in North Queensland: The Retention of Indigenous Religious and Magical Practices." *Journal of Pacific History* 11:66-88.
- 1978 "The Forgotten People: Australia's Immigrant Melanesians." *Meanjin* 37:98-108.

Parnaby, O. W.

- 1964 *Britain and the Labor Trade in the South West Pacific*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Saunders, K.

- 1975a Uncertain Bondage: An Analysis of Indentured Labour in Queensland to 1907 with Particular Reference to Melanesian Servants. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Queensland.
- 1975b "The Black Scourge: Racial Responses towards Melanesians in Colonial Queensland." In *Exclusion, Exploitation and Extermination: Race Relations in Colonial Queensland*, eds. R. Evans et al. Sydney: Australia and New Zealand Book Co.
- 1976 "The Pacific Islander Hospitals in Colonial Queensland: The Failure of Liberal Principles." *Journal of Pacific History* 11:28-50.
- 1979a "'Troublesome Servants': The Strategies of Resistance Employed by Melanesian Indentured Labourers on Plantations in Colonial Queensland." *Journal of Pacific History* 14:168-83.
- 1979b "'The Middle Passage': Conditions on the Labour Vessels from Queensland to Melanesia 1863-1907." *Journal of Australian Studies* 5:38-49.
- 1980 "Melanesian Women in Queensland 1863-1907: Some Methodological Problems Involving the Relationship between Racism and Sexism." *Pacific Studies* 4:26-44.
- 1982 *Workers in Bondage: The Origins and Bases of Unfree Labour in Queensland 1824-1916*. St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.

Scarr, D.

- 1967a *Fragments of Empire: A History of the Western Pacific High Commission, 1877-1914*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- 1967b "Recruits and Recruiters: A Portrait of the Pacific Islands Labour Trade." *Journal of Pacific History* 2:5-24.

Shlomowitz, R.

- 1979a "Team Work and Incentives: The Origins and Development of the Butty Gang System in Queensland's Sugar Industry, 1884-1913." *Journal of Comparative Economics* 3:41-55.
- 1979b "The Search for Institutional Equilibrium in Queensland's Sugar Industry, 1884-1913." *Australian Economic History Review* 19:91-122.
- 1981a "Markets for Indentured and Time-Expired Melanesian Labour in Queensland's Sugar Industry, 1863-1906: An Economic Analysis." *Journal of Pacific History* 16:70-91.
- 1981b "Indentured Melanesian Labour for Queensland: A Statistical Investigation of Recruiting Voyages, 1871-1903." *Journal of Pacific History* 16:203-8.
- 1982a "The Profitability of Indentured Melanesian Labour in Queensland." *Australian Economic History Review* 22:49-67.

- 1982b "Melanesian Labor and the Development of the Queensland Sugar Industry, 1863-1906." In *Research in Economic History: A Research Annual*, ed. P. Uselding, 7:327-61. Greenwich, Conn.: J.A.I. Press.
- 1984 "Plantations and Smallholdings: Comparative Perspectives from the World Cotton and Sugar Cane Economies, 1865-1939." *Agricultural History* 58:1-16.

THE COMMERCIAL TIMBER INDUSTRY IN COLONIAL PAPUA NEW GUINEA

by W. J. Jonas

As in most other colonies, the structure and location of many economic activities in colonial Papua New Guinea¹ were determined by decisions taken in the metropolitan country, in this case, Australia. These decisions were not made in political or economic isolation and their translation into practice was influenced by extrametropolitan events and local colonial conditions. The changing, though continuing, interplay of metropolitan decision making, external events and forces, and colonial conditions (including the natural resource base) is well illustrated by the commercial timber industry in colonial Papua New Guinea. This was particularly so from the end of World War II until the colony achieved independence in 1975.

The war itself forced a change in colonial attitudes. So too did Australia's relations with reindustrializing Japan, an influential visiting mission from the World Bank, and growing international sentiments of anticolonialism. As these attitudes, reflected in official colonial policy, changed, there was an alteration in the structure and location of the commercial timber industry. This paper examines the commercial timber industry in colonial Papua New Guinea as it was affected by colonial policy and practice.

Beginnings of the Timber Industry

In the prewar period both assessment and utilization of the timber resources of Papua New Guinea were haphazard and relatively isolated

occurrences. Papua's forests were explored in 1908 (Burnett 1908) while New Guinea's timbers were included in a more general report by W. Haynes in 1921 (Angus 1972). Both reports were little used. Major investigations were carried out by C. E. Lane-Poole, and his report, *The Forest Resources of the Territories of Papua and New Guinea* (Lane-Poole 1925) was comprehensive and detailed. While not overly optimistic about the value of the forests for timber, he did suggest that they be tapped for their minor products.

Utilization of timber was on a small scale. At least twenty-four permits allowed harvesting over 80,542 hectares. Fifteen sawmills operated, supplying missions, gold mines, and the general needs of the colony. Local demand was quite limited, the 4,720 cubic meters (m³) of sawn timber produced in 1941 being the highest annual prewar figure. New Guinea walnut, sandalwood, and mangrove bark were exported.

Colonial ties were not strong during this period. After 1920 New Guinea was administered by Australia under a League of Nations mandate. Principal products were plantation crops and gold, and the territory was expected to pay its own way. Papua, accurately described by Amarshi (1979) as a "lethargic" colony, received a small, annual grant-in-aid from the commonwealth government. The colony as a whole was also seen as a defense buffer for Australia, and it was regarded necessary only to possess the land for this function to be fulfilled.

During the 1930s copra, the main source of revenue from the supposedly self-supporting New Guinea, began to suffer declining prices, and with the annual grant to Papua being small, other sources of revenue were considered. Interest was again renewed in the forests, especially as the United States began to increase its purchases of the highly decorative and durable walnut timber. A commercial forestry industry was given serious consideration by the Australian government, and in 1938 the first forest officer, J. B. McAdam, was appointed to establish a forestry service. His initial work was soon interrupted by events of World War II.

The assumptions underlying the policy of defense through possession were severely shattered when Japan invaded in 1942. The loose colonial ties that this policy had engendered also changed. The war years were, of course, a special time for colonial relationships. Out of necessity Australia and Papua New Guinea were brought closer, and the results for the timber industry were dramatic.

For a year (1942–1943) after the initial Japanese invasion all sawmilling ceased. In 1942 the New Guinea Administrative Unit and the Papua Administrative Unit were combined to form the Australia New Guinea

Administrative Unit (Angau), which became the administering body of the colony until 1945. To meet wartime timber needs, Angau reorganized and opened sawmills and during the rest of the war produced an estimated 188,814 m³ of sawn timber along with various timbers needed for the vast military operations (Essai 1961). Knowledge of the resource also grew. Under the direction of McAdam, over 30 percent of the colony's vegetation was mapped at a scale of 1:63,360, and by the end of hostilities more than one-quarter of the mapped area had been checked on the ground. After the war, McAdam was able to generalize from these surveys that there existed approximately ninety million m³ of timber resources in the colony.

Changed Policy, Changed Industry

. . . the sleepy days of a colonial backwater could never return. For better and for worse, World War II, more compulsive and pervasive than any earthquake, shook Papua New Guinea into the fast-flowing stream of the modern world. (Ryan 1972:1224)

Australia was forced to reconsider its relationship with its colony, and stronger colonial policy and links were initiated. One of the first changes was temporary administrative union of Papua and New Guinea² under the Papua and New Guinea Provisional Administration Act of 1945. The unification was made permanent by the Papua and New Guinea Act of 1949. Port Moresby became the administrative capital, New Guinea no longer had to pay its own way, and annual grants-in-aid became a significant aspect of the new colonial relationship.³

The annual monetary grants were to strengthen colonial ties as were the policies of "development" of the postwar Australian governments. E. J. Ward, as minister for external territories in the Labor government, pledged that "In future, the basis for the economy of the Territory will be native and European industry with the limit of non-native expansion determined by the welfare of the natives generally . . ." (C.P. Debates, Vol. 183, 1945, p. 4054). His successor in the federal government, P. C. Spender, set the following objectives:

(1) the welfare and advancement of the native peoples, and their increasing participation in the natural wealth of the territories; (2) the development of the resources of the territories to the point at which ultimately they will be economically self-supporting and thus advance their development and the wel-

fare of their inhabitants, and enable them to supply the needs of Australia and the world generally with the valuable commodities that they are capable of producing. (C.P. Debates, Vol. 208, 1950, pp. 3636–3637)

With the restoration of civilian administration, the work of the army's New Guinea Forests Command was handed over to the previously recommended forestry service, the Department of Forests, which was constituted in 1946 under McAdam. Faced with staff shortages, with all the major towns except Port Moresby requiring construction, and with revised colonial economic policy emanating from Canberra, McAdam believed that a forest products industry must become a reality and that it needed to be organized and encouraged through his department. He officially pressed for the controlled working of forest areas, advance planning of forestry products, the establishment of forest reservations, research into utilization and silviculture, inspection of harvesting and marketing, and the training of technical staff (McAdam 1946; Ligertwood 1949).

In 1950 a start was made to put these recommendations into practice. In line with the general policy of unification of the two Territories, forestry laws as they related to New Guinea were also adopted for Papua. This was made effective under the Forestry (Papua) Ordinance 1950 as amended by the Forestry (Papua) Ordinance 1951. A major policy statement was issued by Spender in conjunction with this ordinance: "Recognizing the importance of timber supplies for practically all activities in the Territory, it has been determined that there should be a vigorous forest policy . . ." (C.P. Debates, Vol. 208, 1950, pp. 3640–3641).

The "vigorous forest policy" made provision for the development of a timber industry based on sound forestry principles, public tender for the rights to harvest forest areas with allowance made for the granting of emergency permits (ETPs)⁴ and licenses (ELs) upon private application, and the payment of royalties on all timber cut. In particular the granting of the ETPs had a significant influence on both the scale and location of the industry, for they enabled it to grow in accordance with the colonial policy of uniform development as formulated by Paul (later Sir Paul) Hasluck.

Uniform Development

The policy of uniform development aimed at spreading economic growth and development sectorally and spatially. Areas that, through

lack of contact or lack of immediately accessible resources, were not as "developed" as other areas were to be promoted even if this meant delaying growth in those areas that had already displayed and benefited from some economic advantage.

Although the practical effect of the uniform development policy was largely the opposite of what was intended, three aspects of it were significant for the timber industry. These were the growth of towns, the spread of plantation agriculture in the lowlands, and the introduction of coffee and tea into the valleys of the central cordillera.

Nineteen sawmills and associated logging ventures existed in 1950. Morobe, New Britain, and Central Districts were the scenes of greatest activity. The system of ETPs induced a fairly rapid influx of operations, and by 1955 there were fifty-five units working with a total log harvest for that year of 116,906 m³. In New Britain, eleven operations provided timber for the reconstruction of Rabaul and plantation infrastructure on the Gazelle Peninsula. Seven mills in Morobe provided timber for the rebuilding of Lae and for the resumption of gold mining around Wau and Bulolo. Another seven mills in Central District focused on Port Moresby, where timber was required for building and general construction works in the colony's capital.

The expansion of plantation farming in lowland areas also affected timber production. Before farming could commence it usually was necessary for the mixed tropical hardwood forest to be removed. Planters were granted permits to harvest, mill, and sell timber from their properties under the system of ETPs. In addition to satisfying the growing timber demand, this also enabled plantation owners to earn monies while waiting for crops to come into production. The main areas involved were Central District, where 5,549.5 ha of plantation land were logged between 1950 and 1960, and Northern District, where an Australian sponsored Ex-Servicemen's Credit Scheme necessitated the clearing of 8,058 ha of land, most of which were given over to cocoa plantings.

Coffee and tea production were introduced into the highlands in the 1950s. As part of the new colonial economic policy described above, this crop production was not confined to new settlers. With the increased metropolitan subsidy making agricultural extension work possible, the indigenous highlands people were also encouraged to produce for the export market. The areal spread of coffee production in particular was very rapid and by 1950 more than 5,000 ha, divided roughly evenly between plantations and smallholders, were under cultivation. The expansion of this agriculture and the spread of associated administrative functions created a need for basic and growing infrastructure which

was in part met by timber production. By 1960 there were seven saw-mills in the Eastern Highlands and ten in the Western Highlands.

In general, then, the spread of the timber industry in the 1950s—related as it was to the spread of other activities, especially administration functions and commercial agriculture—was a direct result of colonial policy. The metropolitan government's policy also was responsible for the single most concentrated timber activity of the 1950s, the establishment of a large plywood mill at Bulolo.

Within Australia, where postwar shortages of plywood were being experienced, plywood interests suggested that a joint government-private interest venture be undertaken to utilize the *Araucaria* forests of the Bulolo and Watut Valleys. The New Guinea Timber Agreement Act (No. 40 of 1952) gave legal status to the harvesting and processing of these timbers by Commonwealth New Guinea Timbers Limited (CNGT). Just over 50 percent of the shares in CNGT were owned by the Commonwealth government, the remainder being held by Bulolo Gold Dredging which, as the name implies, was a firm that had previously been involved in gold extraction. At its construction, CNGT's plywood mill at Bulolo was the largest single industrial operation in the colony.

External Influences and Policy Change

Apart from the plywood mill, the scale of timber operations remained small. While the ETPs encouraged growth in the number of timber producing firms, these firms largely provided a service to other activities, they were increasingly scattered throughout the colony, and the industry, in general, was fragmented and introverted. Events of the 1960s changed this: the industry adopted an external orientation, and individual operations grew enormously in size. As in the previous decade, these were specific responses to broader colonial policy, a policy that changed under the influence of circumstances external to both Australia and Papua New Guinea. Highly significant were the postwar recovery of industrial Japan, a visiting mission by the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development, changing relations between Australia and its traditional trading partners, and the influence of world opinion in metropole-colony relations.

Japanese demand for timber rose rapidly after the war. During the 1950s the total consumption of wood in Japan rose from 57 million m³ to 75 million m³ and by 1960 showed no signs of leveling off. The Japanese population rose from 83 million to 93 million between 1950 and 1960; GDP increased at an annual average of 8 percent during the same

period; and per capita income rose from U.S. \$103 to U.S. \$420. In consequence, consumption of wood increased rapidly. From 1951 onward Japanese interests were allowed to invest directly in timber projects abroad so that by the end of the decade Japanese capital had been invested in the forests of Indonesia and the Philippines, and an increasing awareness was displayed in the timber resources of Papua New Guinea.

Loggers in Papua New Guinea also became interested in the Japanese timber market, especially as the domestic market for timber in the colony began to be satisfied by the local sawmills and as restrictions on log exports began to be relaxed. In 1963 an attempt to sell timber to Japan was successful, 354,000 m³ of logs being exported. These were almost exclusively tropical hardwoods used in the construction, furniture, and veneer industries. In the same year it was reported that "the most outstanding influence in the region during the year has been interest in log exports by Japanese timber merchants" (Department of Forests, File 47-4-9, 1963).

Japan soon moved from the role of customer to that of investor as well. In 1964 the New Guinea Lumber Development Company was formed and made available \$1 million for borrowing by log producers. This firm was half-owned by the Japanese company, Southern Trade and Industry, which in 1965 went on to purchase 50 percent of Stettin Bay Timber Company and to undertake the largest log export operations in the colony with all of the export logs from the Hoskins area of New Britain destined for Japan.

Japanese investment abroad had two main aims: the facilitation of market opportunities for Japan's growing export trade and the guarantee of raw material supplies for Japanese industry. Australia's role in this was largely influenced by changing relations with its traditional trading partners. Trade between Australia and Japan grew rapidly during the 1950s. For example in 1949-1950, 38.7 percent of Australia's exports went to the U.K., with only 4 percent going to Japan. By 1959-1960, the share of exports going to Japan had risen to 14.4 percent while the U.K. proportion had fallen to 23.9 percent. This trend continued into the following decade, and by 1963-1964 the percentage figures for the two countries were almost equal.

There were a number of reasons for this. As European countries began to move toward economic integration, Australia began looking more toward trade with Southeast Asia and Japan. Southeast Asian countries and Japan had the advantage of geographical proximity, there were increases in aggregate, if not per capita, incomes in a number of

these countries, and Japan, in particular, exhibited growth in trade and income. In 1957 Japan and Australia signed a trade agreement that guaranteed that Japan would receive most favored nation treatment from Australia. This agreement was automatically renewed in 1960, and its renewal again in 1963 further extended trade concessions to Japan. Obviously, the Australian government was eager to see the continued growth of trade between the two countries. This attitude extended to trade between Australia's colony and Japan at the time when Japan was penetrating further into the world's hardwood forests.

But external political as well as economic changes were also influencing colonial policy. In Indonesia, anti-Dutch action accelerated from 1957 onward with the nationalization of Dutch enterprises and the expulsion of Dutch nationals. By 1960 the Netherlands government, in an attempt to avoid Indonesian confrontation in West New Guinea, created an elected New Guinea Raad (Parliament) and lobbied for independence for the colony, newly named Papua Barat. Indonesia, realizing that this could result in its failing to gain Papua Barat, began to land armed troops by sea and air into the western and southern coastal districts. By 1962 West New Guinea was squarely situated in the cold war because Indonesia had been successful in gaining support from Russia and China.

Australia, meanwhile, had come in for severe criticism at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in London in 1960 for its reactionary colonial policy. Upon his return to Australia, Prime Minister Menzies showed that he at least was reconsidering previous colonial policy with his statement, "when people have to wait too long to independence they achieve it with ill-will" (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 June 1960).

In the same year many issues of colonial and racial origin were flaring up in Africa—probably the most significant being the violence in the Congo—and the United Nations General Assembly also accepted the abolitionist Declaration on Colonialism.

Against this background the 1962 United Nations Mission to New Guinea was highly significant. Led by the extremely influential Sir Hugh MacKintosh Foot (later Lord Caradon), this mission concluded that the entire process of development should be hastened. Among its specific recommendations were that a complete survey of the colony's resources and economic achievements be undertaken by World Bank experts. This resulted in the mission of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in the following year.

The IBRD mission enthusiastically encouraged Japanese and other

foreign investment in Papua New Guinea. This followed its survey of the colony's resources and its recommendation that the policy of uniform development be replaced by one of concentration of effort in those areas where potential returns were considered greatest. Rapid self-sufficiency was the goal, with timber production to play a major role, for

Given the limitations of the Territory market, economic progress means in the first instance expanding production for export and the best prospects for economic growth lie in the fields of agriculture and forestry. These are the only major resources about which enough is known to permit a rapid development in the next several years. (IBRD 1965, p. 32)

Specific recommendations for the timber industry urged a rapid and large increase in the volume and value of exports, the initial production increases to be unprocessed timber (logs) with processed produce to follow, and that the increased production and exports be undertaken by a small number of large firms with expertise in both timber production and export marketing.

Initially reluctant, the Commonwealth government accepted the recommendations, which, for their incorporation into policy and implementation in practice, necessitated the acquisition of vast areas of forested land from traditional owners. As with the entry of the Japanese producers, forest acquisition had begun on a large scale before the IBRD report, but official recommendations were to further endorse as well as speed up the operation.

Acting as broker between the traditional owners and potential loggers, the colonial Department of Forests purchased harvesting rights known as Timber Rights Purchases (TRPs) and reallocated forests to loggers under the system of timber permits. To meet the demands of the Japanese market and the IBRD recommendations, the Department of Forests had to purchase large volumes of timber, and this meant that large areas of land would be involved. The timber had to be physically and economically accessible, and since the logs were to be exported, the forests had to be close to suitable shipping sites. It was also intended that, as far as possible, land harvested for trees should be suitable for the recommended large-scale commercial agriculture.

The coastal lowlands of New Britain provided these conditions, and over 200,000 hectares of forests were acquired for harvesting during the 1960s. Elsewhere, too, vast purchases of harvesting rights were made between 1960 and 1970 and during the early years of the following dec-

ade. These are set out in Table 4, which also shows the uses to which the timber was to be put in line with the IBRD recommendations.

To Independence

Papua New Guinea's transition from colony to independent state was, in many ways, a contradictory process. While the Australian government accepted the IBRD recommendations and implemented practices that, it was hoped, would lead toward economic self-reliance for the colony, it also appeared to be in no great haste to sever the colonial umbilical cord. And, while several large-scale timber projects were commenced, and attempts were made to develop a viable timber export industry, ownership of this industry was not in the hands of Papua New Guineans.

Having acquired legal access to the forests through the system of TRPs, the colonial administration then set about attracting foreign interests to harvest and, later, process the logs. This was done with great enthusiasm. Detailed feasibility studies were conducted and harvesting concessions were advertised in internationally distributed glossy brochures.

Foreign interests, especially Japanese, responded to the invitation. In 1966, the Hoskins operations, by then Japanese owned, were granted a permit to remove at least 28,321 m³ of logs per year for the Japanese market. This permit was followed by others, as shown in Table 1. All of these large-scale logging operations were foreign owned.

Two significant aspects of the logging operations—greatly increased scale of production and concentration of ownership into foreign hands,

TABLE 1 Large-Scale Logging Concessions, 1966–1974

Area	Year Granted	Annual Harvest (m ³)
Hoskins	1966	28,322
Wilelo	1968	4,720
Wilelo	1968	42,483
Navo	1968	20,061
Bakada	1969	25,962
Hargy	1970	106,208
Kaut	1972	28,321
Open Bay	1973	480,000
Vanimo	1974	66,000

Source: Office of Forests, Timber Permits

both a direct result of colonial policy—were also pronounced features of timber processing. As indicated in Table 2, total processing capacity for the industry increased from 231,742 m³ in 1955 to 538,253 m³ by 1970. At independence (1975), almost 95 percent of this processing capacity was foreign owned (Table 3).

The permits and increases in foreign-owned production units were accompanied by a number of grand schemes aimed at further increasing exports and moving Papua New Guinea farther along the road to economic self-sufficiency. These schemes, which included provision for further processing as well as logging for export, are outlined in Table 4. At

TABLE 2 Processing Capacity in all Timber Mills

Year	Total Capacity (m ³ per year)	Increase from 1955 (%)
1955	231,742	—
1960	284,084	22.5
1965	288,598	24.5
1970	538,253	132.3
1975	554,423	139.6

Source: Timber Permits and Department of Forests Annual Reports

TABLE 3 Proportion of Total Capacity by Mill Ownership

Year	Indigenous	Mission	Foreign	Administration
1955	0	2.5	80.5	17.0
1960	0	2.6	83.4	14.0
1965	2.2	5.6	91.8	0.4
1970	1.8	4.6	93.3	0.3
1975	1.4	3.9	94.7	0

Source: Timber Permits and Department of Forests Annual Reports

TABLE 4 Proposed Major Forestry Projects at Independence

Location	Area (ha)	Planned Use
Gogol-Mandang	98,415	Wood chips, sawn logs, veneers
Open Bay	183,000	Wood chips, sawn logs, veneers
Vanimo	297,600	Wood chips, sawn logs
Sagarai-Gadaisu	162,000	Sawn logs
Kumusi	64,000	Sawn logs
Kapuluk	181,000	Wood chips, sawn logs

Source: Office of Forests, *Compendium of Statistics 1975*

independence, the woodchip project at Madang was the only one to have become operational. The project, which involved the clear cutting of timber from over 95,000 hectares of land, in association with saw-milling of the valuable Kwila (*Intsia* spp.), produced the first shipment of woodchips for Japan in 1974.

Planning for these projects, which evolved from IBRD recommendations and were an integral part of colonial economic policy, took place also during a time of growing economic confidence. During the late 1960s and the early 1970s, measurable economic growth rates were high and increasing, exports in general were expanding, and the Bougainville copper mine promised significant revenue from royalties, taxes, and wages. Yet, in part, the projects were to jar with aims that, as independence drew near, were being professed from within the colony itself.

In December 1972, the leader of the government party, Mr. Somare, announced a program of eight aims of redirection and socioeconomic policy and planning. Basic to this new plan was a greater spread of opportunity and income among people and among areas. Translated into forestry policy (see Jephcott 1974) the eight aims were:

1. Increased opportunities for local equity participation in forest industry and forest resources development.
2. Direct earnings toward the forest owners through a share in the royalty, business equity, and other business and employment opportunities.
3. Develop extension services to assist minor forest products industries and village participation in reforestation and forest industry activities. Involve forest owners in all phases of forest development.
4. Create opportunities for contract workers and entrepreneurs in transport, logging, carpentry shops and other small industries.
5. Improve the competitive position of local timber products against imported substitutes.
6. Improve marketing and prices for export timber products to result in higher profit opportunities and thus greater revenue from royalty and taxes.
7. In general context explore ways of increasing opportunities for women to participate in the forest activities.
8. The Department will take overall management responsibility for the forest resources to assure that the national objectives are achieved and forest owners get a fair deal and at the

same time will encourage forest owners and the industry to accept maximum responsibility for forestry activities particularly in the fields of utilization and forestation.

These eight aims involving greater equity and participation for Papua New Guinea were, at least in spirit, in conflict with the planned large-scale foreign-owned schemes. The problem was further exacerbated by the Private Dealings Act (1971), which allowed traditional owners to bypass the government and deal directly with private buyers. Although it was intended that under this act small parcels of timber would be sold, the potential existed for foreign buyers to purchase large areas of the forests. As independence approached, the administrators of forestry policy and practice were in fact operating under two sets of legislation each of which not only conflicted with the other but also contained internal contradictions.

The major departure from previous policy that was incorporated in the eight aims—both in general and specifically for the forestry industry—was the notion of “Papua New Guinea for Papua New Guineans.” Given many of the features of the colonial heritage, such as large areas of forests alienated for large-scale exploitation by foreign firms, this was obviously going to be difficult to achieve.

Conclusion

On 16 September 1975 the people of Papua New Guinea joined the independent nations of the world. The new nation inherited a commercial timber industry the dynamic of which was determined by the interplay of colonialism and world economic forces.

In many ways the former colonists had reason to feel satisfied with the task they had performed and confident that they had left a heritage which would enable the timber industry to contribute successfully to Papua New Guinea's economic base. Despite a general, and perhaps inevitable, background of political and legislative confusion, the economic future of the industry seemed well assured and policy had been formulated for its continued operation. The export market for logs had been successfully penetrated and processing was expanding. The world needed timber, and Papua New Guinea was in a position to meet some of that need.

Japanese and Australian investors were interested in timber projects that would provide Papua New Guineans with income, employment, and infrastructure. The problem of poor and multispecied forests

appeared to have been overcome by clear cutting for wood chip operations; more than one million hectares was available for wood chipping and major multiple-use schemes. The external orientation of the industry was well established, and it seemed the industry could only continue to prosper.

But prosperity for whom? It seems most unlikely that prosperity for the majority of Papua New Guineans could have ensued, because the two processes that determined the structure and dictated the operations of the forestry industry both worked to serve metropolitan interests. Colonialism is based on inequality; without this inequality it could not exist. World market forces are based on inequality; trade is not equal; somebody must profit from trade and without this profit trade, and the production that feeds it, would not exist as the world market economy knows it. By 1975 Papua New Guinea had experienced almost one hundred years of colonialism and especially since World War II had been increasingly drawn into the world market economy.

Colonialism and expansion of the world market economy have worked together, the former facilitating the latter, and both operating to intensify and maintain the inequality on which each is based. In Papua New Guinea the legislative power of the colonial government enabled it to acquire more than two million hectares of forests from traditional owners at low prices for trade and processing within the colony and increasingly abroad. This trade favored metropolitan interests, especially Japan, which required timber for industrial and domestic use, and Australia, which wished to benefit from trade with Japan. Colonial policy, encouraged by metropolitan-backed international agencies, allowed penetration into Papua New Guinea of large-scale, capital-intensive operations, the aims of which were increasingly to extract value from the forests and transfer it abroad. Employment of Papua New Guineans in this process was minimal and then in non-decision-making, laboring roles. Papua New Guineans were mostly sellers of timber in forms of trade and production that were encouraged by colonial policy and activity in the name of economic growth and by promises of "development." As practiced during the period of formal colonialism, ownership and control of the Papua New Guinea timber industry was concentrated in the hands of metropolitan powers and colonial agents.

Japan wanted timber for its development and had the technology to utilize the difficult forests of Papua New Guinea. Australia wanted timber and had access to the softwood forests. It also wanted infrastructure and economic growth in the colony and, most importantly, it wanted

trade with Japan. The IBRD saw foreign investment in forestry projects as contributing to the development of the poor countries containing forest resources. Expansion of foreign investment into the forests of Papua New Guinea and expansion of the world market economy of which this investment is a fundamental part were made possible by Australian colonial policy.

All statements of good intention to the contrary, provision of infrastructure, apart from that required for extraction of the forest resource, was minimal. Timber was acquired from the traditional owners in great haste and under clumsy and cumbersome legislation. Disputes over land became increasingly common. Measured in terms of investment and output, the industry experienced considerable growth. But this was economic growth that, by extracting value from Papua New Guinea, favored metropolitan development, a process that in this case was facilitated by Australian colonial rule.

W. J. Jonas
University of Newcastle
New South Wales

NOTES

1. Papua was formally colonized by Britain in 1884, the same year New Guinea was annexed by Germany. Australia gained Papua as a colony in 1905, and New Guinea was awarded to Australia as a mandated territory by the League of Nations in 1920. The independent nation is known as Papua New Guinea, and for this paper this name is used unless a distinction is being made between Papua and New Guinea.

2. After this union, the colony was known officially as the Territory of Papua and New Guinea.

3. The combined Territory received, for example, more than \$4 million in 1946-1947 and over \$6 million in 1948-1949, compared with the 1939 grant to Papua of \$90,000.

4. ETPs were valid only for stated time periods, specified minimum and maximum volumes to be cut, and demanded the construction of a sawmill of specified milling capacity.

REFERENCES

- Amarshi, A. 1979. The Economy: The Development of Peripheral Capitalism. In A. Amarshi, K. Good, and R. Mortimer, *Development and Dependency*. pp. 3-60. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Angus, R. J. 1972. Forestry. In P. Ryan, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Papua and New Guinea*, pp. 447-463. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press and University of Papua New Guinea.

- Burnett, J. 1908. *Timber Trees of the Territory of Papua: Reports and Catalogue*. Melbourne: Department of External Affairs.
- Commonwealth of Australia. 1945. *Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives*, vol. 183. Canberra.
- Commonwealth of Australia. 1950. *Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives*, vol. 208. Canberra.
- Essai, B. 1961. *Papua and New Guinea*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. 1965. *The Economic Development of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Jephcott, B. 1974. *National Forest Policy Papua New Guinea*. Presented for Information of Members of the House of Assembly, August, Port Moresby.
- Lane-Poole, C. E. 1925. *The Forest Resources of the Territories of Papua and New Guinea*. Melbourne: Government Printer.
- Ligertwood, G. 1949. Report of the Royal Commission Appointed to Enquire into Certain Transactions in Relation to Timber Rights in the Territory of Papua New-Guinea. Commonwealth Parliamentary Paper No. 55. 1949. Canberra.
- McAdam, J. 1946. The Forests of the Territories of Papua and New Guinea. Unpublished typescript in the Office of Forests Library, Port Moresby.
- Office of Forests. 1975. *Compendium of Statistics*. Port Moresby.
- Ryan, P., ed. 1972. *Encyclopaedia of Papua and New Guinea*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press and University of Papua New Guinea.

RACE RELATIONS IN THE PRE-COLONIAL PACIFIC ISLANDS: A CASE OF PREJUDICE AND PRAGMATISM

by I. C. Campbell

On the whole, race relations in the Pacific islands have been free of the worst manifestations of racialism which are observable in Australian and American history and, to a lesser extent, in New Zealand history. Race wars have been absent, and in the late twentieth century the transition from colonial to indigenous rule has not witnessed the tensions and settlers' fears that have been characteristic elsewhere.

People are apt to conclude from this fairly obvious truth that there was some special quality about racial and cultural contacts in the Pacific, stemming either from some trait of Pacific peoples (their much vaunted tolerance and hospitality) or an attitude on the part of Europeans that was reserved for Pacific islanders (romanticism, humanitarianism, and the myth of the noble savage). This perception—more often implied or assumed than articulated—suggests that there was some mystery about Pacific race relations, and that understanding race relations in the Pacific therefore requires the supposition of nebulous influences that were unique.

It is argued in this essay that peoples and attitudes in the Pacific were no different than elsewhere, even though the quality of interracial behavior very often was. Numerous examples from Melanesia and Polynesia suggest that the most significant feature in the culture contact process was the absence of any clear superiority of power in the hands of one group. Necessity occasioned tolerance and cooperation; opportunity demonstrated bigotry, intolerance, hostility, and violence; and the attitudes and beliefs familiar to scholars of race relations every-

where can be discerned quite clearly in Pacific history. In short, specific historical circumstances rather than subtle background preconditions are responsible for the comparative harmony of Pacific race relations.

In the continental territories—the new white nations of the future—race relations developed in a context of settlement. Conflict thus became a basic ethic through competition along racial lines for the ownership of resources. The manner of exploiting those resources—a cultural difference—differed also along lines that were largely racial. Thus commercial agriculture was contrasted with subsistence agriculture; pastoralism with hunter-gatherer techniques; industrial metallurgy with stone technology; urban civilization with its prolific tertiary industries was contrasted with relatively small-scale, non-urban communities that were much less differentiated. While there were exceptions on both sides, it is broadly true that in the colonies of settlement the first in each of these economic dualities represented the invading Europeans, while the second in each case represented the indigenous peoples. The first also represented greater wealth and technological power and, ultimately, greater military strength as well. Racial attitudes and behavior are not entirely to be explained in terms of these dualisms; on the contrary, existing attitudes were to a large extent responsible for the continued existence of these dualisms. There are many examples in Australian history, for example, of Aborigines becoming successful farmers, tradesmen, and entrepreneurs and competing successfully with Europeans on European terms, but being excluded from membership in the dominant society by virtue of racial prejudice. In this manner the Aboriginal farmers of Coranderrk in Victoria were deprived of their lands through intrigues of their white neighbors (Reynolds 1972:57–66; Jenkin 1979: chaps. 2 and 8; Barwick 1972:11–68). Similarly in New Zealand the Maoris found that the adoption of European farming methods and successful participation in a money economy did not persuade the settlers of racial equality (Ward 1974:39, 284–285 and chaps. 18–20).

The doctrine of racial inequality, therefore, would seem not to be simply dependent on the existence of economic dualism but to have a more complex origin. The contrasting ways of life at the time of first contact merely contributed to the acceptance of existing ideas of racial inequality. This acceptance of racial inequality at the beginning of the nineteenth century developed by the middle of the century into the dogma, accepted by most settlers, that the respective races were destined to be profoundly different as a result of the operation of a law of nature, or law of history. The destiny of the indigenous people was to be

depopulation, loss of social and political cohesion, dispossession and impoverishment; that of the invaders was to be political and social dominance: the inheritance of the earth.

In the Pacific it was to turn out differently—at least for a time—and the principal difference was that the Pacific islands were not to become colonies of settlement until late in the nineteenth century, and many of them not at all. When Pacific islands did become absorbed into the European empires the spirit of trusteeship not infrequently prevailed.

In the late eighteenth century when Europeans and some Pacific islanders began to come into relatively frequent contact, Europeans were passing through a periodic outburst of primitivism in which Polynesians and other islanders figured prominently. Rousseau, among others, had helped to publicize the doctrine of the noble savage, and the Romantic movement continued to project a sentimental and idealized picture of primitive life, providing much of the basic sympathy for non-Europeans that gave the humanitarian movement of later decades much of its impetus. From the noble savage doctrine in the 1760s (which suggested that “savages” could do no wrong) to the humanitarianism of the *Aborigines’ Protection Society* of the 1830s (which held not that the “savages” could do no wrong, but that the “natives” were more sinned against than sinning), there is a more or less direct line of descent (e.g., Mellor 1951: introduction).

Perhaps the most important difference between the two movements was that the noble savage was a model of native superiority, of natural virtue, beside which civilized Europeans looked meretricious, a little shabby, and very debased. To many of the humanitarians and their contemporaries, the “native” was a creature to be pitied, protected in his helplessness in the face of the European onslaught: a variety of man who had moral and spiritual rights but who was less well fitted by nature than was the European to survive. For this creature, contact with the West was certain to be fatal unless positive steps were taken to elevate him in the scale of creation. This patronizing if charitable attitude was but a short step from the scientific racism of the later nineteenth century.

The humanitarian movement was to have an enormous impact on race relations and on official policy in the Pacific: it provided a stimulus for missionaries, objectives for consuls, and policies for colonial administrators. In contrast, the noble savage myth had much less direct effect on events in the Pacific. The notions of primitive nobility and virtue, or the related idea of the classical simplicity of the islanders, which are erroneously thought to pervade the accounts of Bougainville, Banks,

and their contemporaries, were not widely shared. Such preconceptions did not in fact color the perceptions or actions of Europeans who went to the Pacific in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (Campbell 1980:45-55). On the contrary, there was nothing to distinguish Europeans who went to the Pacific islands from those who went to Australia, Asia, Africa, or America; and among all these people the idea of the noble savage seemed, if it was known at all, a contradiction in terms. The noble savage was never a popular idea; it was no more than a philosophical abstraction, propounded for and discussed by academicians and the literati, propagated among their social equals, and soon abandoned for another enthusiasm. The idea was so much at variance with firmly rooted popular ideas about savages that a passing interest was all that should be expected. That it was seized upon by satirists so quickly indicates that it had no firm hold among the prejudices of the people. There is no reason to think that it ever penetrated further in the ranks of society than to the frequenters of salons and coffee houses.

The majority attitude, and the one most firmly rooted in European civilization in the late eighteenth century, was the very familiar one seen in other historical periods: that colored races were inferior, that they were ferocious, barbaric, treacherous, and probably cannibal, destined for menial and subordinate roles in their relationships with Europeans. This is the attitude taken by Europeans into the Pacific from the age of exploration up to the twentieth century. Captain Cook, famous for his humanity and forbearance, for his insistence on a concept of improvised justice, is conspicuous most of all because he was an exception to the general rule. He knew he was dealing not with ideal prototypes of humanity, but with living human beings with their own desires and failings, who were simply "no wickeder than other men." Like any manager of men he knew that the survival of his expeditions lay in being able to forestall any threats that might arise. More revealing of popular attitudes is the fact that Cook had repeatedly to restrain his crews from wanton mistreatment and even indiscriminate shooting of islanders (Beaglehole 1955-1967, 1:195, 239, app. 2, 4; 2:365-366, 414-418). The indifference toward bloodshed that was so common of the age is more indicative of racial attitudes than any philosophical tract pleading the cause of the noble savage.

Cook, in the end, died at the hands of the Hawaiians on a visit during which several Hawaiians had been needlessly killed. Other explorers had their problems: Wallis in 1767 had to defeat the Tahitians before he could establish workable relations; Surville in 1770 showed brutality

and a want of tact in his relations with the Maoris, despite the kindness they had shown him; in 1773 Cook's companion Furneaux lost a boatload of ten men to the Maoris; in 1772 the French explorer Marion du Fresne was killed in New Zealand. Wallis's companion, Carteret, left a trail through the Solomons marked with bloodshed at every place he stopped, though through no personal fault of his own. Bougainville at almost the same time also had clashes in the Solomons—and even in Tahiti, where he had been so courteously received, relations were marred by Tahitian thefts and French musketry (Beaglehole 1966: chaps. 9–12).

With the development of commerce, which was inevitably in the hands of men less high minded than the explorers, and whose crews were less subject to control, it was only to be expected that instances of misunderstanding, attempted exploitation, and bloodshed would multiply. The earliest trades were the pork trade between Tahiti and New South Wales and the Hawaiian sandalwood and provisioning trade, both of which were well established before the end of the eighteenth century. The former was generally conducted without violence, but also without much respect on either side as the Tahitians extorted as much as they could from the English, and the English showed their disgust at the covetousness and transparent opportunism of the Tahitians (House 1801–1802:20, 28, 30; Turnbull 1813:370). In Hawaii the islanders lost little opportunity in attacking vessels and abusing and mistreating the sailors who were left on shore to trade; the traders, for their part, showed little reluctance to exploit native wars or to conduct massacres of their own (Ingraham 1790–1792:64–65, 68, 70, 72–73; Bloxam 1825: n.p.).

In the late 1790s in Tonga, beachcombers and missionaries alike failed to establish long-term, workable relations, and in 1802, 1804, and 1806, the Tongans attacked European ships that called there for refreshment. The Tongans soon had a reputation as a “nation of wreckers” and commanders of ships were warned against calling there (*Sydney Gazette*, 6 Aug. 1809, 17 Sep. 1809).

Throughout Polynesia, therefore, relations between Europeans and islanders developed within a framework of commerce, and commerce was conducted with a good deal of wariness and suspicion on both sides—notwithstanding that the Polynesians were the supposedly friendly natives. Wariness was to be even more called for in Melanesia.

The Fijian sandalwood trade, which was conducted between 1804 and 1815, gave the Fijians a reputation for ferocity that they kept for decades afterwards. Assaults on wooding parties, attacks on ships, bom-

bardment of villages were not everyday events, but they were everyday possibilities. Cooperation between trader and chief often depended on the sandalwooder being prepared to fight—and defeat—the chief's enemies, and even then cooperation was not guaranteed. Nor was victory: in the aftermath of one such deal, Peter Dillon (later famous as the discoverer of the fate of La Pérouse and his expedition) had to flee for his life and take refuge with several other Europeans on a rock pinnacle where he was besieged for several hours (Dillon 1829, 1:9–24). Dillon, then as later in life, prided himself on his good relations with Pacific peoples. The sandalwood trade in Fiji closed in 1815. The last ship to seek the fragrant wood had four men killed by the Fijians, including Oliver Slater, perhaps the first European ever to have lived with the Fijians in the first years of the century, and the man whose reports had begun the trade (*Sydney Gazette*, 4 Mar. 1815).

The trade in Marquesan sandalwood began as the Fijian trade closed, and although the Marquesans were perhaps most famed for their “proverbial” hospitality, they were also feared for their constant wars and cannibalism, rumors of which greatly magnified reality. This trade is one of the least well documented in Pacific history, but it is evident that fear and bloodshed were an intimate part of it (*Sydney Gazette*, 8 Nov. 1815, 5 Aug. 1816; Roquefeuil 1823:54).

By 1820 Marquesan sandalwood had been exhausted, and Hawaiian sandalwood was to last only a few years longer. Before any commercial hiatus developed, the whaling trade began to boom. Whalers had begun to operate in the Pacific in 1790, but the European wars and then the Anglo-American war of 1812–1814 kept the scale of operations small. By 1820, however, the American whaling fleet had begun its rapid expansion, voyages began to lengthen beyond two years, and the demand for provisions and refreshment suddenly became a major trade. Islands that were poor in the accepted commercial resources of the Pacific were able to supply whalers with fresh food and water in exchange for a variety of European artifacts from hoop-iron to muskets. Contact relations in the provisioning trade were workable but not necessarily good. One beachcomber wrote early in the century that “ships touching at any of these Islands in the south sea frequently meet with accidents, sometimes through their own misconduct, and sometimes thro the hostile beheaviour of the natives,” and gave some examples of how easily violence developed—sometimes through simple misunderstanding, other times by ill-will or by misjudgment engendered by fear. After praising the forbearance and unvengeful nature of his adopted countrymen, the Marquesans, he concluded:

I hope, if ever this Narrative should fall into the hands of any-one frequenting the pacific ocean, [they learn] to be cautious and not to leave things in the way of these Kind of people, as they are apt to pilfer. Never fire a ball till you are obligated, nor be allured from your boat on any account, as at several Islands in these seas they will entice you from your boat with their young women, who will lead you from the beach into the bush. There you get murdered, and the boat becomes their prize, if the ship is not well in shore so as to have the boat under cover of the ships guns. (Dening 1974: 103, 105–106)

Supplying whalers became a major industry, especially at those islands with safe, commodious harbors and ample land and labor. The Hawaiians, like the Maoris and other peoples, modified their agriculture specifically to supply the demand for food, potatoes in particular. Prostitution became a regular trade, and for over three decades (until the late 1850s or early 1860s) these two activities were the economic mainstay of the Hawaiian kingdom and the means of obtaining the much sought Western artifacts everywhere.

Familiarity promoted easy relations in the more frequented islands, but the continuing risk, resulting from continuing suspicion, was pointed out by an American officer when he acknowledged the usefulness of beachcombers and missionaries: “their residence offers some inducements for vessels to resort there, and are generally a preventive to violence from either party by giving confidence to both” (Browning 1835–1836:99, 50, 121).

The principal difference between the provisioning trade and the more specialized and speculative trades was in the length of time a ship had to stay in one locality. A whaler usually could get its business done in a few days, and few stayed in port for more than a fortnight. A sandalwood trader might be weeks in one place; a *bêche de mer* vessel, in contrast, could be months. Collecting this marine creature from the reefs was a slow process and required cooperation from the islanders in the form of a large labor force if the work was to be done in a reasonable length of time. After collection from the shallow reef waters the creatures had to be dried before being packed for shipment. Long drying sheds were constructed close to the collecting points. Drying racks were fitted to the sheds and fires maintained beneath them twenty-four hours a day for weeks at a time. The process entailed some of the ship's crew being on shore for protracted periods, and the opportunities for ill-conduct on both sides were ample.

The trade was entered into readily: "The king told me I must not go in the ship, but tell the captain to come and trade with him for *bêche de mer*" ([Cary] 1922:44), declared one beachcomber on the arrival of the first ship he had seen for years. Willingness was no guarantee of safety: the beachcomber William Cary tells of a Fijian attempt to capture the *Glide*, on which he was working as an interpreter in 1830. The attempt failed, with loss of life on both sides. Cary continues,

Fortunately for us I brought off a chief with me who wished to visit the ship. When I told him that we had two men killed by the natives of Ovalau he was very much frightened. I told him he need not be frightened, but he was a prisoner for the present. The captain told me to get every thing we had on shore off to the ship. We went to Camber with two boats to take off our property. When we arrived we found the men that I left in care of the establishment much alarmed, fearing an attack from the natives. They had been under arms all night. The natives had been very insolent and troublesome during my absence. We immediately commenced loading our boats and five or six canoes which I hired for the purpose.

When the natives found their chief was detained they very readily assisted us . . . and behaved very civilly, but I have no doubt if we had not had the chief on board they would have robbed and perhaps killed us all.

Shortly afterward in another part of the Fiji group the trade, which had been going well, was interrupted by a drying house catching fire.

. . . the natives became troublesome, annoying us in every possible manner both night and day, stealing everything they could get hold of and continually insulting some of our party in the grossest manner, which we dare not resent.

I bore it until it became past endurance and I began to fear that they had still worse intentions. I then went on board the ship and informed the captain. . . . He went on shore . . . and was soon satisfied that it would be imprudent to stop longer. . . . ([Cary] 1922:67-68)

Throughout the 1830s, when the *bêche de mer* trade was at its height, there were constant rumors of conspiracies to attack ships (actual attacks were less frequent), threats against shore parties, and a

constant need for Europeans to be armed. For their part, the Europeans were not at all sympathetic toward Fijian life and conducted their affairs with a fixity of purpose and a ruthlessness commensurate with their driving anxiety to fill the ship with *bêche de mer* as quickly as possible, with as little loss of life as possible. They had little respect for the Fijians and little trust in the fidelity of the chiefs; commercial necessity was the principal foundation for such fair and consistent dealing as prevailed ([Wallis] 1967:119–121, 137–140; also Eagleston 1830–1833:296; 1833–1836:9, 14, 34; 1836–1837:98).

Other forms of commerce for the rest of the century were conducted in much the same atmosphere: roughly consistent dealing with substantial mutual agreement on its terms, in an atmosphere of mutual suspicion. The Melanesian sandalwood trade, which flourished in the 1840s and tapered off in the 1850s to near extinction by the early 1860s, was marked early on by violent clashes. The hostility of the inhabitants and the apparent inevitability of bloodshed ensured that more than a decade was to pass between the first attempts to collect sandalwood in 1826 and 1829–1830, and the establishment of a regular trade. Such was the violence of the trade—both actual and threatened—that it soon became a byword for white depravity, ruthlessness, exploitation, and fraud; those who conducted it became prime targets for the philanthropists and humanitarians who argued that the islanders were the inevitable losers from any contact with Western civilization (Shineberg 1967: chap. 6 and *passim*).

This view has been challenged by modern scholars who maintain that there is unequivocal evidence that if the islanders did not want to trade then no business could be conducted. Among the reasons most commonly put forward for occasional native refusal to trade were traditional agricultural or ritual commitments, or dissatisfaction with the quality or variety of trade goods offered. Fraud by the islanders, fluctuating prices, and attacks on ships were all risks for which a trader had to be prepared. The trade had no place for a man who was inclined to be charitable, who could not drive a hard bargain, who could not be ruthless, or who was less than constantly vigilant. Traders had constantly to put themselves into the hands of the islanders and they did so feeling anxious and vulnerable. Trade was frequently conducted from boats under the protection of the ship's guns. Fear of the natives permeated the character of perhaps every man engaged in the trade. Whether the islanders felt the same way is hard to say, but it was they who were in the position of greater strength. The trade required of its personnel that they not be sentimental or liberal in outlook; the circum-

stances in which they worked seemed to preclude the likelihood of their being apostles of racial harmony (Shineberg 1967: chaps. 13, 14, and 16).

Andrew Cheyne, an early participant in the trade, reported the prevailing attitudes and conduct of those engaged:

I again went round the Island cutting Wood with a small party of men well armed, but in consequence of many narrow escapes and threatened attacks by the Natives, I considered it no longer prudent to do so. . . . The natives would neither show us the trees, nor render any assistance whatever—about 50 Natives followed us into the bush, and it required the utmost vigilance on our part to prevent them from Snatching our Arms or Tools out of our hands. . . . I . . . made up my mind to return at once to the ship and delay no longer here as the vessel's charter was an expensive one, and I could not see any possibility of getting a Cargo at this place. . . .

. . . all savages are treacherous and cruel to the last degree they are much addicted to thieving and covet every thing they see. . . .

. . . My experience among Savages . . . has taught me a . . . lesson, and the more I know of them and their character and habits, the less I am inclined to trust them. Natives ought never to be suffered to come on deck, but should be kept in their canoes, and away from the vessels side, especially when any work is going on, or when getting the vessel underweigh. . . . Those who have the most experience of savages, invariably trust them the least, and are always on their guard against treachery. (Shineberg 1971:90–91, 127–128, 142)

Every student of race relations knows that “treachery” and “covetous” and other value-laden words often conceal genuine misunderstanding; often their use is simply the result of a culture-bound perspective. That may or may not be sometimes the case with Cheyne; but whether or not ethnocentrism, racism, or misunderstanding were present, there clearly was not a great deal of liking or respect on either side. In other words, trade was conducted despite all the possible difficulties that might arise.

The labor trade that became so infamous in the eyes of those committed to native welfare and protection grew out of the sandalwood trade. In the 1850s the latter was becoming less and less profitable, and at the

same time European crews were less willing to work in it. Both problems could be partly offset by the employment of Melanesians, both on ships and at shore stations away from their homes. With the recruitment of island labor, race relations took a turn for the worse. The island laborers, away from their homes and having no affinity with the people with whom they worked, became almost totally dependent on their European employers. Here was scope for abuse, callous treatment, and fraud far greater than before; and now Melanesian employees rather than European employees bore the brunt of dealings with the owners of the sandalwood trees. The degree of fear and suspicion between the parties was not ameliorated by the substitution of one race for another, for Melanesians had developed no loyalties based on skin color but traditionally regarded all outsiders as enemies.

By the end of the decade the sandalwood trade was dominated by Robert Towns, who also had plantation interests in Queensland. His career bridges the sandalwood and labor trades. The step between recruiting labor to cut sandalwood and recruiting labor to work in Queensland was, in principle, a short one. The horrors for which the labor trade became notorious—kidnapping, murder, overcrowding, hiring by misrepresentation, and so on—have a substantial degree of truth in them. The trade was likened by critics to the African slave trade, which Britain had not participated in since 1807 and which decades of naval patrolling and international diplomacy had aimed at stamping out altogether. To observers of the Pacific labor trade this business was a horrible atavism that in the name of humanity had to be stamped out. The outcry led to the passing of regulatory legislation by both the Queensland and Imperial parliaments in 1868, 1872, and 1875, with further amendments in later years (Morrell 1960: chap. 7; Docker 1970:54, 58, 245 and *passim*).

The regulatory legislation was only partially effective. In some respects it was unworkable, but the standards observed in the trade improved nevertheless. Recent historians argue that this improvement was the result of the internal logic of commerce: fraud could not work indefinitely; people could not be duped so easily once they had lost whatever innocence they might have had. As with the sandalwood trade, the islanders' numerical strength and control of the desired resource put the recruiters at a disadvantage. Consequently, the latter had to operate with extreme caution and pay due attention to the foibles, demands, and prejudices of the islanders. The trade continued for nearly half a century and only came to an end when colonial governments, and later the Australian federal government, decided for reasons

of their own to prohibit the traffic. Among the islands that provided the laborers and received the benefits in terms of European trade goods, the cessation of the traffic was a disruptive and bitter experience (Docker 1970: chap. 11; Corris 1973: chap. 8).

Nevertheless, although the trade was entered into with the willing participation of both parties, it was conducted in the same atmosphere of suspicion, fear, and risk-taking that had characterized the earlier trades. Captain William Wawn, who worked in the trade for nearly twenty years, described his habitual method of recruiting laborers. He always used two boats, together, for safety.

Our boats, two in number, were each pulled by four islanders. . . . Each native boatman was armed with a smooth-bore musket, cut short so as to lie fore and aft on the boat's thwarts under the gunwale. . . . The whites—the recruiter in one boat, and the mate and G.A. [Government Agent] in the other—had revolvers and Snider carbines. The smooth-bores of the boatmen were, a few years later, changed for Snider carbines, and the whites generally adopted the Winchester. Each boat carried a 'trade box'. . . .

. . . the boats are lowered, and pulled or sailed along the coast, stopping wherever natives collect, the ship keeping as near to them as possible. . . . The recruiter's boat having been backed on to the beach stern first, the keel just touching or resting on the sand, the savages crowd about the boat. . . .

The intending recruit comes close to the boat for inspection, a friend carefully guarding him on each side, not so much to prevent kidnapping as to stop him from getting into the boat before he is "paid" for, and thus spoiling the bargain. The amount of "pay" once settled, the recruit gets into the boat, and passes forward into the bows. If the covering boat is on the scene, it is backed in, and the recruit transferred to her and taken off to the ship if convenient. . . . (Wawn 1973:8, 14-16)

The amiability that frequently prevailed was made possible by the sense of security provided by the precautions described by Wawn. When vigilance or care lapsed, the real dangers of the business became evident, even as late as the 1890s. "I never made a voyage," wrote Wawn, "either in this [New Hebrides] or the Solomon groups without most of us experiencing the sensation of a bullet or an arrow whistling past us occasionally." But, he argued, "it ought not to be forgotten that

it is to the trader's interest to be friendly with, and to behave fairly towards, the islanders" (Wawn 1973:35, 214).

For a century, therefore, there was a consistency in the relations that developed between the Europeans who came in ships and the inhabitants of the islands. Sailors for the most part looked down on the islanders as an inferior class of beings, and showed little reluctance to take a life as long as their own was not thereby threatened. Herman Melville's observation of his fellow sailors in the 1840s seems to be generally applicable:

Indeed, it is almost incredible, the light in which many sailors regard these native heathens. They hardly consider them human. But it is a curious fact, that the more ignorant and degraded men are, the more contemptuously they look upon those whom they deem their inferiors. (Melville 1924:24)

There seems little reason, therefore, to attempt to distinguish between such men and the working class frontiersmen who had much to do with shaping race relations in colonial Australia, New Zealand, and North America.

For their part, the islanders were not slow to shed blood if it seemed to be in their interests. On the whole they were not greatly impressed with the fair-skinned foreigners: they resented wanton killing when they were the victims; the fair skin and pale eyes of Europeans were often offensive to their own standards of beauty; they had their own suspicions of foreigners, whether white or brown, and they were usually fully aware that most of the white men they met were of low class. The obvious poverty and subordination of such men were self-evident in both Polynesia and Melanesia where wealth and stature were marks of status. This was especially true in Polynesia where society was more usually hierarchical (Campbell 1982:64-80). The lack of regard was thus reciprocal, so that when race relations were good, it was because both sides were in pursuit of something they valued.

Different attitudes and values were involved in the interracial transactions when resident missionaries came upon the scene. Their arrival was erratic: London Missionary Society Protestants in Tahiti, Tonga, and the Marquesas in 1797; Wesleyans in Tonga in 1822 and 1826, spreading to Fiji in 1835; American Protestants of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (A.B.C.F.M.) in Hawaii in 1820; Catholic missionaries in Hawaii in 1826 and 1837, and spreading through the South Pacific in the 1830s and 1840s; Presbyterians in the

New Hebrides after 1848. Missionary attitudes were complicated: their social background (for Protestants often upwardly mobile, lower middle class) implies assumptions of European racial superiority. Their theology condemned the cultures of the heathen as diabolical, and enjoined them to love and raise in the scale of civilization the people who were thus the creatures of the Devil. Their relationship therefore was replete with ambivalence. Their vocation, of course, brought them into more sustained and intimate contact with the people than most other visitors. For years on end, often for a lifetime, they lived in close proximity and constant daily contact with the islanders—teaching, preaching, healing, remonstrating, advising. Whatever racist prejudices they might have brought with them from their homelands, their experiences taught them a certain respect for the Pacific islanders. Many of them came to admire the complexity of Pacific languages, the intellectual challenge of their cosmogony, the subtlety and ingenuity of their theological arguments. At the same time they despaired of the superficiality of their understanding of Christianity and the political and materialist basis of their conversions.

The great majority of the missionaries lived amicably and harmoniously with the islanders, whether Polynesian or Melanesian. A degree of disdain and racial prejudice often persisted, however. Examples can be found of missionaries using terms like “poor brown dick” and “dick broadnose” with their implications of denigratory stereotyping (Gunson 1978:204–205), and there was probably no missionary of the nineteenth century who would have even entertained the thought of allowing his daughter to marry a Polynesian or Melanesian. A degree of aloofness was always maintained, consonant with the hierarchical society from which they came. Critics of missionaries are quick to point to evidence of missionary aloofness and imply racial prejudice—the large mission house on the hill with its own iron roof and picket fence, for example—forgetting both that fencing was not unknown to Pacific islanders and that a measure of privacy was essential for much of a missionary’s work. There was nothing sinister or inherently discriminatory in the missionaries’ adherence to their own cultural norms. They were, moreover, the evangelists of a civilization, not just of a religion. Their whole purpose was to be exemplars and to teach the islanders to live as they themselves did—not to adopt local customs. Consequently, that they should see a degree of inequality between themselves and the islanders, with themselves as superior in certain respects, was an inescapable perception and one that was shared by the islanders. It was, moreover, based on the premise of the goal of attainable equality. Sometimes this attitude of

superiority was manifested as high-handed or arrogant behavior, which although virtually inevitable was not necessarily racist.

More important was the willingness of the islanders to accept the missionaries. Sometimes they were not willing: Catholic missionaries in Hawaii were expelled in 1827 and were ejected from New Caledonia in 1847. Protestant missionaries withdrew from Tahiti in 1798, from Tonga in 1800 and 1822, and several times from the New Hebrides before meeting with their first success there in 1850. Indifference or suspicion was a common early response, but the relative wealth of the missionaries often made a favorable impression, while as men of learning and as priests they commanded respect. Favorable early foundations were not always built on, but the islanders' desire for foreign wealth and power created a demand for the means to attain it (religion, literacy, and medicine) and ensured the good standing of the medium (e.g., Wright 1958: chaps. 7 and 8).

So far, race relations exemplified a pragmatic tolerance springing from a recognition that neither side could afford the consequences of intolerance, let alone of violence. The advantages of mutual tolerance grew into a mutual dependence, which was the most effective regulator of behavior.

New problems in race relations were to arrive with settlement of another kind, which began in Hawaii in the 1820s. Attendant on the whaling trade came white settlers to trade, not so much with the islanders but with the whalers. Hawaii's strategic location in the middle of the north Pacific and the early establishment of stable government made it an ideal place for ship refitting, with consequent opportunities for ship chandlers and provisioners. In their train came grog shops and general stores and a multitude of professions and trades to meet demand. Lawyers and consuls were not to be far behind. With this kind of growth, race relations were placed on an entirely new footing. Tensions grew between the Hawaiians and the whites in the form of rivalry in business, land ownership, and legal authority. Social distance increased as white society became more heterogeneous and therefore more self-contained, although the physical segregation of other settler towns was less evident in Honolulu. Before the 1820s came to an end, the white residents of Honolulu had begun to challenge the legitimacy of the native Hawaiian chiefs to legislate for them and exercise jurisdiction over them.

Extractive and provisioning trades were not to become a permanent economic staple for any of the island groups. Commercial agriculture was both an economic necessity and an attraction to settlers whose

political philosophies held a place for the doctrine of racial inequality and for the aristocratic tradition of a landed, hereditary social and political elite. Opportunities for large-scale commercial agriculture were consolidated into plantation systems that shared many of the characteristics of plantation societies elsewhere: the concentration of wealth in relatively few hands, a dependent, rural labor force of a different race from the landowners, and by extension, the belief that each race was naturally fitted for certain roles and places in society, and for differential rewards. Race stood in a fair way to becoming a definition of social class. In the emerging plantation society of Hawaii, race relations became tense periodically between the 1830s and the 1890s as Europeans sought a greater share of political power and as Hawaiians and the subordinated immigrant groups resented the increasing wealth, arrogance, and influence of white Europeans. The Europeans in their turn, between the 1850s and the 1890s, became more strident in their articulation of the doctrine of white supremacy as they came face to face with Chinese and Japanese ambitions for social mobility and economic advancement (Lind 1938: chaps. 9 and 10; also Daws 1974:179–182, 209–213).

A similar process was to develop in Apia, the main town in Samoa in the 1850s, and a decade later in Levuka, Fiji. The social life of the two races, which during the beachcomber era and the early years of resident traders had been more or less integrated, now became increasingly segregated; interracial marriages, once the rule, became scandalous and children of mixed race an embarrassment. Doctrines that were unmistakably social-evolutionist became the stock-in-trade of the settlers, with more or less sinister overtones (Ralston 1977: chap. 8). To a minority of Europeans it seemed that contact between primitive and civilized led to an unfortunate process of inevitable decline of the colored race. To the majority this formula sounded hollow, sentimental, and hypocritical. To them the colored races were inherently inferior; it was the law of nature that they should make way just as lower forms of life, unable to adapt, had always to make way for higher forms of life (Young 1970:157). These ideologies are familiar to colonial historians everywhere. Their propagators in the Pacific came from the same society as their propagators in the continental colonies of North America, Australia, and Africa. Many of them in Hawaii, Samoa, Fiji, and the New Hebrides had themselves been colonists in America or Australia, and they carried these attitudes with them. In the Pacific islands, where a society with colonial characteristics already existed—that is, a society that had already become a socially self-sufficient white enclave within a

large, colored, potentially hostile and powerful native population—these racialist doctrines flourished as they had been unable to do earlier.

The reason that racialist ideas did not flourish earlier was not that they had not been born. The consistency of attitudes and behavior of white visitors to the Pacific from the late eighteenth century to the end of the nineteenth has been demonstrated. The powerful restraints on the behavior of Europeans were prescribed by their dependence on the islanders. Numerical inferiority and the exigencies of trade enforced a relationship in which a great deal of heed had to be taken of the islanders' wishes: more heed, in fact, than the islanders needed to take of the visitors'. The relationship was seen by all participants as an unequal one of mutual benefit.

With the advance of acculturation—in particular the adoption by the islanders of metal tools and firearms—the relationship of dependency began to swing, and with it the onus of conciliation. It would not swing very far by itself: what pushed it to the other extreme was the growing self-sufficiency of Europeans, which allowed the new expression of a cultural and racial arrogance that had never been entirely absent. Not needing to find native wives, being able to import labor from elsewhere, buying land and thus acquiring a resource base that rendered them economically independent of their island neighbors, and then finding that American and European governments or their naval representatives were prepared to support them in their disputes with the native authorities, provided the hothouse conditions in which the existing plant of racial animosity and prejudice could flourish on a scale previously unknown.

The massive depopulation that occurred on the continental frontiers, the racial wars, the bitter hatred, the exclusiveness that was to keep antagonism alive long after the wars had finished, did not characterize the Pacific islands. Before the end of the century something of this process had begun to develop in the groups that had been annexed by France and Germany. Those territories that were to become English speaking were spared the worst of these traumas. Only two of these groups were to acquire any considerable body of white settlers. In Hawaii land alienation was undertaken with the consent of the Hawaiian government in a context of a steep decline of the native population. A bellicose settler stance was thus not necessary, while a widespread sense of hopelessness and despair muted the defiance of the Hawaiians. In Fiji the worst was prevented first by the establishment of settler governments in partnership with traditional authority—which thus recognized the reality of Fijian power—and secondly by annexation. The

governorship of Sir Arthur Gordon (1875–1881) placed the interests of the Fijians ahead of those of the settlers. His policy was unpopular with the settlers, but the actual and sublimated violence of the 1860s was permanently avoided. Subsequently, economic difficulties in the 1890s confirmed that Fiji was not to become a white man's country.

The quality of race relations, therefore, was not governed by romantic views or disinterested hospitality. The belief in racial harmony that seems to call for an idealist explanation is in fact false: economic relationships had much more to do with the behavior of the races toward each other. But in the final analysis, economic activity provided only the matrix of contact. The really critical consideration in determining the quality of Pacific race relations was that of power. Whichever party was dominant was able to show its true character; when neither party was dominant there had to be compromise. In other words, race relations in the Pacific were subject to the same rules and show the same patterns of cause and effect—not different ones—as race relations elsewhere. Circumstances made the Pacific a more pleasant place to be.

I. C. Campbell
Adelaide University
Australia

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barwick, Diane. 1972. "Coranderk and Cumeroogunga: Pioneers and Policy." In T. S. Epstein and D. H. Penny, *Opportunity and Response*, pp. 11–68. London: Hurst and Co.
- Beaglehole, J. C., ed. 1955–1967. *The Journals of Captain James Cook*. Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society.
- Beaglehole, J. C. 1966. *The Exploration of the Pacific*. London: A. & C. Black. Third edition.
- Bloxam, A. 1825. "Extracts from the Journal of A. Bloxam, B.A., Worcester College, Oxford. General Naturalist on H.M.S. 'Blonde' at the Sandwich Islands in 1825." Unpublished. Mitchell Library, Sydney.
- Browning, R. L. 1835–1836. "Notes on the South Sea Islands by R. L. Browning U.S.N. on Board the U.S. Ship Vincennes Circumnavigating in 1835–6. J. H. Aulick Commanding." Unpublished, Browning Family Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
- Campbell, I. C. 1980. "Savages Noble and Ignoble: The Pre-conceptions of Early European Voyagers in Polynesia." *Pacific Studies* 4(1):45–59.

- . 1982. "Polynesian Perceptions of Europeans in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." *Pacific Studies* 5(2):64–80.
- [Cary, William S.] 1922. *Wrecked on the Feejees*. Nantucket: Inquirer and Mirror Press.
- Corris, Peter. 1973. *Passage, Port and Plantation*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Daws, Gavan. 1974. *Shoal of Time*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Dening, Greg, ed. 1974. *The Marquesan Journal of Edward Robarts 1797–1824*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Dillon, Peter. 1829. *Narrative and Successful Result of a Voyage in the South Seas*, 2 vols. London: Hurst, Chance and Co.
- Docker, E. W. 1970. *The Blackbirders*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson.
- Eagleston, J. H. 1830–1833. "Journal of the Voyage of the Barque, Peru to Fiji. . . ."
- . 1833–1836. "The Voyage of the Ship Emerald to the Fiji Islands."
- . 1836–1837. "The Voyage of the Brig Mermaid."
- Unpublished typescripts, University of Adelaide Library. Original manuscripts in The Essex Institute, Salem; also available on Pacific Manuscripts Bureau Microfilms 205 and 223.
- Gunson, Niel. 1978. *Messengers of Grace*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- House, William. 1801–1802. "Transactions on Board the Armed Colonial Brig Norfolk at Otaheita. 1801 and 1802." Unpublished. Mitchell Library, Sydney.
- Ingraham, Joseph. 1790–1792. "Journal of the Voyage of the Brigantine 'Hope' from Boston to the North-West Coast of America, 1790 to 1792." Unpublished. Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington.
- Jenkin, Graham. 1979. *Conquest of the Ngarrindjeri*. Adelaide: Rigby.
- Lind, A. W. 1938. *An Island Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mellor, G. R. 1951. *British Imperial Trusteeship*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Melville, Herman. 1924. *Omoo: A Narrative of Adventures in the South Seas*. London: Oxford University Press (World's Classics).
- Morrell, W. P. 1960. *Britain in the Pacific Islands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ralston, Caroline. 1977. *Grass Huts and Warehouses*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Reynolds, Henry, ed. 1972. *Aborigines and Settlers*. Sydney: Cassell.
- Roquefeuil, Camille de. 1823. *A Voyage Round the World between the Years 1816 and 1819*. London: Richard Phillips and Co.
- Shineberg, Dorothy. 1967. *They Came for Sandalwood*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

- Shineberg, Dorothy, ed. 1971. *The Trading Voyages of Andrew Cheyne, 1841-1844*. Wellington: A. H. and A. W. Reed.
- Sydney Gazette*, 1809, 1815, 1816.
- Turnbull, John. 1813. *A Voyage Round the World in the Years 1800, 1801, 1802, 1803 and 1804*. . . . Second Edition. London: A. Maxwell.
- [Wallis, Mary D.] 1967. *Life in Feejee, by 'A Lady'*. Ridgwood: Gregg.
- Ward, Alan. 1974. *A Show of Justice*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Wawn, William T. 1973. *The South Seas Islanders and the Queensland Labour Trade*. Ed. Peter Corris. Canberra: Australian National University Press; Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Wright, Harrison M. 1958. *New Zealand, 1769-1840. Early Years of Western Contact*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Young, John. 1970. "Evanescent Ascendancy: The Planter Community in Fiji." In J. W. Davidson and Deryck Scarr, *Pacific Islands Portraits*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.

EDITOR'S FORUM

PACIFIC HISTORY AS SEEN FROM THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

by David Routledge

Introduction

Pacific Islands historiography—in the sense of expressions of opinion as to the nature and purpose of Pacific history writing—has accumulated considerably in volume since J. W. Davidson first published his inaugural lecture as Professor of Pacific History at Australian National University in 1955.¹ This is not to be wondered at. What is perhaps surprising is the pertinacity of doubts as to what Pacific history is or ought to be, and doubts also as to the proper way to pursue its study. The prevailing definition has been unsatisfactorily narrow, appearing in particular to eliminate from consideration the interactions of Pacific Islanders among themselves. It is doubtful if any of those who have written about what Pacific history ought to be would admit that they meant to deny altogether a place for Pacific Islanders in their own history. On the other hand, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Islanders have not been regarded as its main protagonists by definition.

The origin of this unsatisfactory state of affairs lies, I believe, in the assertion that Europeans will inevitably be party to the processes that Pacific historians may legitimately study. Davidson himself once stated that, "We limit ourselves to the period during which non-European societies have been in contact with the West."² A recent reviewer, before going on to praise a study of an aspect of European activity in Fiji, said, "the history of post-European Oceania is, first and foremost, an era of

foreign domination.”³ Both statements may be true (ignoring the semantic difficulties in equating “history” with “era” in the second), even though modern historians are becoming increasingly confident in the absence of documentary evidence, and thus of dealing with non-literate contexts. The statements reflect, however, an attitude of mind—and thus an orientation of approach—that harbors a potentially unproductive fragmentation of the study of the Pacific Island past.

It is this which is the danger. It may be accepted that non-Islander historians have become less Eurocentric in their writing. It may further be acknowledged that historiographical ruminations are less important than actual results. But as long as there is the possibility for Pacific Islanders to read statements of purpose about Pacific history that appear to deny them what they consider to be their rightful place, there is also the possibility that they will reject as irrelevant to themselves the work of those who have made such statements. The result would be a fragmentation of effort just at a time when the possibilities for productive interchange are beginning to assume significant dimensions. The purpose of this paper is to review the statements that have led to the present situation and to suggest certain clarifications that need to be accepted in order to reduce the likelihood of Islander and non-Islander Pacific history going separate ways. It is less concerned to review the achievement of the last thirty-five years than to establish a baseline from which work should now proceed.

European-oriented Perceptions of Pacific History

Davidson argued in his inaugural lecture that Pacific history belongs ultimately in the field of modern history, of which “the primary interest . . . has been the evolution of Western Europe,” and further, that it has “its more immediate origin” in imperial history, concerned with the expansion of European influence throughout the world.⁴ From this it followed that Pacific history should focus on the different kinds of European activity (exploring, trading, evangelizing, governing, etc.) as these impinged on the lives of the people of the Islands, and that the center of interest should be shifted from metropolitan capitals to the Islands themselves. Davidson did not emphasize what might be termed the autonomous activities of the people. Although he referred to the need to understand “indigenous tradition” and “the role traditionally ascribed to a political leader,” and stated that “few subjects would, perhaps, be more rewarding than a study of the growth of indigenous participation in the money economy,”⁵ he did not make explicit the status of Pacific

Islanders as the major protagonists in their own history. Studies of immigrants, of the communities they founded, and of the industries they established were all mentioned in the course of the lecture. Only in the conclusion was there a suggestion that "analyses of the indigenous forces that have . . . contributed to the making of the contemporary Pacific" should also be part of the Pacific historian's brief, and then only in relation to the primary study of the transformation which has been the result of "the impact of the Western world."⁶

These precepts formed the basis on which the Pacific History Department at Canberra—as it was then called—set to work, and detailed studies of the different kinds of European activity and of immigrant communities began to accumulate.⁷ Because these studies centered on outsiders, even if the arena of action was the Islands, a knowledge of Pacific languages was not necessary and students were not required to seek such knowledge. This was in contrast to those in the department working in the field of Southeast Asian history. It is interesting to note in the present context, therefore, that Southeast Asian historians early accepted the necessity for an autonomous history of the region—in the sense defined above.⁸ But even Davidson's certainty of the need for Island-centered history and the development of techniques capable of dealing with the multicultural situations he believed to be its essence were questioned. Munz was doubtful of the literal possibility of a history that was not firmly rooted in a European cultural and methodological context, warning of the cultural arrogance of foisting upon non-Europeans "an idea of their past which is assimilated to our own idea of our past"; he concluded that non-European history must remain "at the most . . . an adjunct to European history."⁹

Davidson himself dealt with some of the most obviously dubious points raised by Munz, particularly those concerned to assert an intrinsically Judaeo-Christian element in the notion of an absolute chronology focused on the birth of Christ. The force of his rebuttal was substantially vitiated, however, when he concluded that his ideas and those of Munz were not as far apart as it might at first appear. In particular, he made clear that his conception of Pacific history would have to be satisfactory in terms of the European historical tradition in order to be satisfactory to himself. He suggested that the cause of Munz's misapprehension was an underestimation of the pervasive effect of European influence throughout the past five hundred years, and reiterated the opinion that Pacific historians should not attempt to penetrate the Pacific Island past before Europeans appeared on the scene.¹⁰ The post-European Pacific Islander past on which Europeans had not impinged

was also excluded by his insistence on a preoccupation with multicultural situations. In doing this, Davidson not only seemed to establish a methodologically conservative discipline, but to deny a concern with the continuity of the Pacific Islander past, going back through the colonial period to the period of first contact with Europeans and ultimately to the original peopling of the Islands by their first inhabitants.

By breaking Pacific history out of its matrix of imperial history and establishing it as a specialized branch of the subject of history as a whole, concerned with the multicultural situations of the post-European contact period, Davidson began the process of "decolonization." How successfully his initial impulse has been built upon, however, is a matter open to doubt. European explorers, traders, beachcombers, settlers and planters, missionaries, diplomatists, politicians, and bureaucrats have all received attention. Part of the process of understanding the full ramifications of their actions has involved an examination of the Pacific Island context and the reaction of Pacific Islanders, but this has been done as by an outsider looking in. Despite a number of significant exceptions, the central concern has remained the analysis of European action. Davidson himself noted the pioneering work of his colleague, Harry Maude, when he sought to analyze the effect on Pacific Island societies of European beachcombers and castaways. Even more significant for the argument of this paper was Maude's celebrated monograph on the Gilbertese *boti*, which "commenced," in his own words, "with the coming of Tematawerebure and his followers from Samoa in approximately A.D. 1400."¹¹ This was no study constrained by absolute chronology, by methodological conservatism, or by the European distinction between history and prehistory. Maude himself cited the achievement of Raymond Firth, who, besides analyzing his material as a functional anthropologist, looked again at it as a historian.¹² More recently, Greg Denning's account of the Marquesas Islands from the time of European contact until 1880 was a tour de force of the ethnohistorical method, which seeks to combine the insights of history and anthropology.¹³ Marshall Sahlins, anthropologist par excellence, is presently preoccupied with a history of the wars between Bau and Rewa in early nineteenth-century Fiji. This list is by no means exhaustive, but the point remains. Studies oriented from the Islander point of view have been made only infrequently.

Even the role of Islander practitioners has been questioned, and done so, moreover, in such a way as to justify the prevailing situation. O. H. K. Spate, for example, claimed that because there have not been sufficient numbers of Islanders properly trained in the European-con-

ceived discipline to take over, Europeans "cannot help but make the running." Should they not, he warned, "the history goes by default, and its very raw material may be lost."¹⁴ Those Islanders who have chosen to write within the European-established tradition have been criticized either for what they do or what they do not do. In the course of a review of Sione Lātūkefu's *Church and State in Tonga*, Noel Rutherford chided the author for not making full use of the special advantages Pacific Islanders enjoy when they write their own history.¹⁵ He did not say precisely what these were or how they might be integrated with the European tradition. And when he wrote that Lātūkefu had thus let slip through his fingers a chance to say something quite rare, he left a certain sense of mystery about what exactly had been missed. Islanders have also been chided for opting out altogether, as when—confronted with such insuperable obstacles to European style history as the absence of an absolute chronology and the impossible blurring of the categories of myth and historical fact—they have chosen to write in the form of poems, stories, novels, and other fiction.¹⁶ Sometimes the criticism has been made to cut both ways. Rutherford said that the ponderous gravity of Lātūkefu's writing resulted in scholarly history but unexciting literature.

This kind of negative attitude—instead of a simple recognition that Firth's *History and Tradition of Tikopia* and Maude's study of the Gilbertese *boti* pointed the road to follow—has led to an unwarranted degree of self-satisfaction in certain quarters. Some non-Islander historians have considered themselves free, in the words of Kerry Howe, to continue "to do what can be done, and generally to do it well,"¹⁷ that is, to continue writing about the Pacific past so as to emphasize the importance of Europeans. Justification for this approach has not been achieved without the expression of a certain amount of doubt. John Young wrote in 1979 that Pacific history "has become an ambiguous concept and is in danger of becoming an incomprehensible one."¹⁸ His concern was prompted by a consideration of the first volume of Spate's tremendous study of the Pacific as an "artefact," on the one hand, and the Canberra collection entitled *More Pacific Island Portraits* on the other. Spate himself was careful to define his work as "a study of the Pacific, not of the Pacific peoples," and its purpose, "to explicate the process by which the greatest blank on the map became a nexus of global commercial and strategic relations." He admitted, moreover, that his study would in all likelihood be among the last essays in an obsolescent genre, "a requiem for an era of historiography."¹⁹ Young saw the difficulty as being how to accommodate under the same rubric

world-encompassing analysis and island-oriented vignettes written by historians troubled with misgivings as to the feasibility of what they were trying to do, and also their qualifications for success. Young congratulated these historians on their achievement, but regretted the absence of Islander contributors to the collection.

Spate himself, clear in his own mind that he was not writing about the peoples of the Pacific, was not so certain what Islander historians should be trained for:

. . . certainly not exclusive rights to the writing of Islands history, but just as certainly a role which is more than simply explaining their own view of themselves and their story, and what it is like to be on the receiving end of colonialism . . . the right to have their own view of their history built in as a functional, indeed a foundational part of the structure.²⁰

This statement is indicative of the insidiousness of Eurocentric attitudes. Pacific history will center on Pacific Islanders and this must be accepted as such, by definition. It is the views and the record of the activities of others that should be regarded as being "built in." The qualification of the term "functional" with "foundational" suggests that Spate was aware of this to an extent, but a radical revision of the conception of Pacific history, and the way its writing should be approached, is apparently necessary among many non-Islander historians.

The achievements of Pacific historians working in the European-oriented tradition were recently reviewed by Howe.²¹ He bluntly concluded that unless the prevalent burrowing after every available scrap of information about ever more narrowly defined topics gives way to something more constructive, the discipline is in danger of losing all sense of purpose. His proposed future directions, however, were disappointingly vague. He accepted the propriety of the previous generation's concentration on "the social, economic, political, and intellectual changes experienced by island societies as a result of their ever-increasing interaction with Europeans and Western influences generally," and was careful to make clear that he was not being critical of information-gathering itself. He believes, with Davidson, that empiricist research at the micro-level needs to be based upon "certain generalizations," but, again with Davidson, did not detail what these should be. His recommendations, therefore, largely involved organizing the same material in ways that would hopefully be more effective: in histories of individual

islands and groups; in synoptic histories of the region as a whole; in studies organized thematically, on a comparative basis, and of the region in various wider contexts. Only his last suggestion, a plea for more interdisciplinary investigation, contained something new in that it alluded to the need for a greater use of theory. He believes it would be sufficient, however, to borrow theory from the social sciences (he did not specify which). Moreover, in referring to Denning's discussion of the ethnohistorical technique, he failed to address one of its most important points. The historian, of whatever inclination, must develop and modify his own analytical tools or else run the risk of suffering the nervousness and ambivalence consequent in finding himself in a kind of no-man's land between two areas of study. Howe took some of his own advice in his "new South Sea Islands history from first settlement to colonial rule."²² The book is a major and welcome contribution to Pacific historical studies, but it does exemplify some of the prevailing Eurocentric preoccupations. The study was thematically organized, but the author freely admits that much was left out—on the grounds of scant knowledge, but also in the belief that the piling of example on example could become otiose. Micronesia was thus ignored altogether and Melanesia dealt with in a final section that not only has something of the feeling of an afterword, but brings out the extent to which the history of the Islands—as considered from the point of view of the inhabitants—is fragmented to the point where meaningful synopsis is impossible to achieve. In his preface, Howe wrote that people in the Islands might disapprove of his work being based on printed sources and European scholarship, justifying his approach on the grounds that "modern Pacific history exists in the absence of as yet established alternative perceptions."²³

The purpose of the remainder of this article is to suggest that there is such a perception—that of Pacific Islanders of their own history—with which there must be an accommodation if students of the Pacific past are not to become divided into two separate camps, each regarding the work of the other as irrelevant to its own purpose.

Pacific Islanders' Perceptions of Pacific History

Experience teaching at the University of the South Pacific has been an important influence on the views expressed below. Students there demand the opportunity to study a history that is relevant to themselves, and that relates to *their* past. They do not wish to ignore altogether the spread of European influence, but rather to examine it in

such a way as to relate it to their central concern: the past of their own societies. The legitimacy of such a demand has been recognized in many non-European contexts (as I have acknowledged above) to the point of becoming a truism. It has been stated explicitly on a number of important occasions, and Davidson and some at least of his colleagues have come to accept these precepts—without actually spelling them out—in their work on the Islands generally.²⁴

It is the confused nature of some recent statements that justifies this article, for expressions of purpose are sometimes noticed more than is warranted by their casual nature. Matters of particular concern include the attitude toward oral evidence, the nature of a time frame and the delineation of temporal relationships appropriate to the multicultural context, and the study of social categories rather than simple sequences of events. I do not argue that traditional preoccupations should be abandoned, only that these other matters should receive adequate attention. My purpose, as stated above, is to point to the danger of the further development of an arid fragmentation of the study of Pacific history: Islander-oriented historians, on the one hand, accusing Europeans of being neocolonial in their approach, concerned to perpetuate their own dominance of the history-writing process and thus denigrating the wish of Islanders to study their own history as they believe it should be studied; and Europeans, on the other hand, dismissing Islanders as inadequately trained and therefore incapable of writing within the Western historiographical tradition at all.

It should perhaps be emphasized that admitting the possibility of a different kind of Pacific history does not necessarily imply some sort of relativist stance. The nineteenth-century belief that “what actually happened” in the past was a defined entity that historians could grasp, and then, by their writing, make accessible to their audience, has long since crumbled. Croce and Collingwood demonstrated the extent to which history writing is the product of the historian’s individuality, his scholarly attitude and rigorously objective analytical method notwithstanding. E. H. Carr compared Acton’s conviction that he and his colleagues could forge their way along the road to “ultimate history” with Sir George Clark’s opinion that historians of his generation expected their work to be superseded again and again, as knowledge of the past was processed through minds of different identity, purpose, and point of view. Carr believed that the difference was a reflection of Victorian “clear-eyed self-confidence,” in contrast to the “bewilderment and distracted scepticism” of the post-1945 era.²⁵ This was to underestimate the effect of advances in the techniques of the discipline, and of the vast

proliferation of material available to historical analysis. It also failed to give Clark his due, both for recognizing these developments and for dismissing as irrelevant and worthless the scepticism of the complete relativist. Acton's vision of ultimate history might have dimmed irretrievably as historians realized that the "subject matter even of a narrow, particular history" was inexhaustible, that "the nearer we come to 'total cover,' the further we move from the primitive historian-like exactness."²⁶ This did not mean, however, that because the historian's cover was so much less than total, a whole range of interpretations was possible, with any one as good as any other.

The effect of the coming together of these two trends—realization that history changes as society changes, and increasing awareness of the potential of modern techniques for the writing of history—takes on a particular form when, as in the Pacific Islands, the nature of social change involves the decolonization process. Much has been written about the effects of colonization on both the conception of the past forced upon the colonized, and the way the past has been studied.²⁷ Colonial administrators, epitomizing Victorian attitudes, not only believed that they were the sole agents of historical change, but thought that they possessed a background of theoretical knowledge permitting them to understand better even than the people themselves the nature of the societies they administered. Such opinions formed the basis for policy formation and then became supported by the authority of the law. The views of the colonized were devalued, their society—and the beliefs about the past that defined it and gave it meaning—treated with patronizing condescension if not outright contempt and set into a social and intellectual straitjacket. After independence, the reviving of culture and the redefining of identity by means of reemphasizing the continuity backwards from the present, through the colonial period to traditional times, became a matter of pressing concern.²⁸

Within this context, Davidson's theoretical contribution may be seen as a crucial first step, but no more than that. Ahead of his time to begin with, and concerned like few others of his generation to understand the Pacific Islander reality, his later work evidenced that he had moved beyond his own initial precepts.²⁹ But because he was less interested in the theoretical aspects of his discipline than in its practice, he did not found a school of history.³⁰ There has thus been a failure to accommodate study to the changed circumstances of the post-independence era. There has further been a comparative failure to involve Pacific Islanders by giving them the training and then the opportunity to write the history they would like to write. For non-Islander students, it is still

less than obligatory that they learn a Pacific language in order to study Pacific history. This is to a degree ironical, given that Davidson devoted a great part of his time as professor to assisting island nations in the transition to independence, and given also that he would have accepted the view of Pacific Islanders as to what Pacific history ought to be. For them, Pacific history must have as its central concern, as its major objective, the penetration of the past of Pacific Islanders, with the object of making that past accessible to the present.

This means not only that the Islands must constitute the environment but that Islanders must be the main actors. The history must not only be Island-centered but Islander-oriented. It must also be a history of all the people, not merely a narrow section of them. The actions of Europeans will figure, and figure with decisive effect, but theirs will be the actions of outsiders, powerful maybe, but rarely other than a tiny minority. Study will be pursued using all the tools of the contemporary discipline, and may be carried out by anyone with the inclination. "Decolonized" historians will be recognized by an attitude of mind, not a color of skin, and "decolonized" history by an orientation with respect to human action, not locale. This means that non-Pacific Islanders are not prevented by definition from writing Pacific history any more than Englishmen are prevented from writing French history. There is nothing mysterious about penetrating the past of Pacific Islanders as compared with the past of anyone else. The endeavor, on the contrary, rests on a firm conviction of the oneness of mankind, and therefore of its history, and on a recognition that the methodology relative to scientific inquiry into the whole of the human past is of universal application.

This implies three things of great importance for the immediate future of Pacific history. First, Pacific historians who wish to maintain a unity and coherence in their specialty, must study the past of entire societies, and not merely multicultural situations that formed only a part of the actions of those societies. Secondly, they must study process, and not merely sequences of events. And thirdly, they must emphasize social categories rather than individuals, even if such a category can only be defined through an accumulation of detail about individuals. I do not say that none of this has been done before, though when entire social categories have been studied they have usually been of outsider origin. What I do say is that the Islander past, studied as I have suggested, has not been recognized as the central concern, in the words of Spate, "the foundational part of the structure." Moynagh has thus seen nothing inappropriate in calling his excellent study of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company "a history of the Fiji sugar industry," even

though it effectively ignores the society of the Indians who grow the sugar and the Fijians upon whose land it is grown.

If my discussion so far seems to lean toward the tenets of what is sometimes called social history, that is my intention. Social history has been practiced longer than Pacific history as a discipline has existed in the minds of its exponents. It emerged from the clash and contact of the social sciences, which since the 1920s have each tried to demarcate clearly their areas of particular competence. At first sight, it appears a little curious that in spite of the continual assertion of the need for interdisciplinary cooperation, the idea of social history has not been explicitly proposed in the Pacific context. But on second thought, this may not be so strange after all. Social history originated within the French academic tradition, finding its greatest masters in the *Annales* school founded by Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre. Pacific history, on the other hand, has been dominated by the English—one might have said the Antipodean—academic tradition. Social historians, moreover, do not so much engage in avowals of the desirability for interdisciplinary cooperation as attempt the whole task themselves, recognizing that history by committee is rarely satisfactory.

The *Annales* school addresses itself to the long perspective in history. Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, in *The Peasants of Languedoc*, for example, "endeavoured . . . to observe at various levels, the long-term movements of an economy and a society—base and superstructure, material life and cultural life, sociological evolution and collective psychology . . . a great agrarian cycle, lasting from the end of the fifteenth century to the beginning of the eighteenth. . . ." ³¹ This is the *longue durée*, the long span of history, to use the phrase made current by Fernand Braudel, another eminent "annalist."³² The concern is with the persistent patterns of the long term, with the quantitative and the structural, with what is recurrent, or at least comparable, in the process of history. The somewhat disparaging term *histoire événementielle* "history of mere events," is used for the traditional orientation toward a surface history of the actions of great personalities.

The *longue durée* may not exist in a manner amenable to study by the Pacific historian, but the attitude toward historical process it represents is worthy of serious consideration nonetheless. The span may be short, as compared with that available to Le Roy Ladurie in his studies of southern France,³³ but it is long enough for the persistence of structures to be detected and analyzed. Young has already suggested that the arbitrary starting points of a Pacific history oriented toward the colonial experience must be rejected, to be replaced by a culturally continuous

history with respect to the people themselves.³⁴ Beginning at the beginning, and including as much as possible of the pre-European, such a history would place the colonial episode in a wider perspective, rejecting the periodization of an alien point of view. Above all, it would be the history of an entire social order as it existed through time, and not merely of those multicultural situations involving the impingement of outsiders, or of a narrow elite.

This does not mean that the seeking of detailed knowledge of events should be abandoned. Quite the contrary. However, analysis should be organized with the purpose of revealing the way in which chance elements ("*éléments aléatoires*," "*conjonctures*") influence underlying structures. Le Roy Ladurie, in his discussion of the Chouan Uprising for example, pointed out how the minute analysis of key events may reveal the nature of transition from one structure to another.³⁵ The battle of Kaba, 7 April 1855, was an event of similar import in the history of Fiji, marking the transition from a genuinely indigenous polity to one defined by Europeans. Kaba brought to an end a period in which the great chiefs, using the traditional methods of war and the exploitation of *vasu* privileges, struggled for hegemony over the Koro Sea and its surrounding territories. Cakobau, Vūnivalu of Bau, came closest to success, but during the twenty years preceding Kaba when he was effective ruler of the chieftom, he was never able to consolidate his power.³⁶ The reasons for this lay in the underlying social structure, particularly in the relationship between predominant cleavages in society and the resources that leaders were able to command as a result. Such a study requires the knowledge of Fijian society and its oral traditions usually considered the purview of the anthropologist, but, in addition, the historian's technique of assessment by comparison and a recognition that traditions change as the structure of society changes through the long perspective.

The same relationship between surface events and the underlying social structure is to be observed in the processes by which a number of more purely Polynesian polities experienced a trend toward a monolithic character in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. John Garrett recently wrote that the missionaries were king-makers in the Pacific, with the future kings acting as patrons of the missionaries and the missionaries depending on them for ultimate success.³⁷ This was to separate out one element of a more complex and more essentially Pacific situation. The political implications of the Wesleyans' relationship with Tāufa'āhau in Tonga, for example, effectively prevented their seeking a similar role in Fiji, but this was a chance element in the situa-

tion in 1855. Thus, if its role in the long process of Fijian history is to be understood, it must be related to the underlying structure of strongly defined clan or tribal entities, held together by ties of kinship and clearly associated with certain localities, which, in the final analysis, were not amenable to unification.³⁸

Whole societies, then, must be studied, and studied, moreover, according to the worldview of the people themselves. Much that is misleading, particularly with reference to such "exotic" manifestations as cargo cults and fertility rites, has been written by students approaching their task from within an inappropriate epistemological context. As Denning put it, with respect to circumcision, the anthropologist's definition of a "boundary-maintaining mechanism" is meaningless to a young man wishing only to avoid derogatory comments from potential sex partners.³⁹

The approach entails the exhaustive study of social groups both in terms of structure and process, and of internal and external relationships. The techniques of quantitative analysis, and the systematic exploitation of oral evidence are of great importance, as three recent studies show. All are based on an exhaustive study of the social group concerned. That each was composed of immigrants rather than an indigenous population no doubt facilitated this, but the advantages to the results are striking and worth striving for in other, perhaps less tractable, contexts.

Malama Meleiseā's study of Melanesian plantation laborers left behind in Samoa after repatriation ceased in 1921, deals with a very small group indeed.⁴⁰ By the mid-1970s only six men survived, two of whom were too old and ill to be interviewed. The study thus consists of four brief biographies and a concluding chapter placing them in a wider sociohistorical context. Although the conclusions are congruent with those of Corris for the labor traffic in the Pacific, and of Firth for plantation conditions in Samoa during the German period, they have the distinction of being based on first-hand collection, and thus have an authority greater than the small number of informants might suggest. It can reasonably be inferred, moreover, that the recollections are broadly reflective of the conditions and way of life in general of Melanesian laborers in Samoa. One aspect of the all-too-brief study that begs for more extensive treatment concerns the way of life of the Melanesians' descendants. With respect to the government-owned Mulifanua plantation, for example, Meleiseā states that 43 descendants of 13 unrepatiated laborers still work there, and that the daughter of one of his informants could name no fewer than 262 such descendants in all.⁴¹ A

sense of community clearly persists, and further study would obviously be worthwhile.

Whereas Meleiseā's study would have benefited from being conducted fifty years previously, when all the 150-odd unrepatriated laborers were still alive and available for interview, Brij Lal's study of the 45,439 Indian laborers who passed through the Calcutta depot on their way to Fiji⁴² would have been impossible before the computer. The study rests on the evidence derived from analysis of the personal and social data contained on the emigration passes. These were available for every individual processed through Calcutta, and include such details as name, caste, father's name, districts of origin and registration, depot number, and ship number. Lal, however, did not stop at quantitative analysis of the structural aspects of his study. Believing that "quantitative" and "humanist" history form a complement rather than a dichotomy,⁴³ he sought information in folksongs and oral testimony about such things as motivation for emigration. The result reveals, to use his own words, "the structural dynamics of indentured emigration."⁴⁴ His conclusions authoritatively demolish a number of persistent misconceptions concerning indentured labor in Fiji. And because they are based on massed details pertaining to actual individuals, they may, like those of Meleiseā, be taken to be at least broadly true of the entire social category—that is, of all indentured laborers to have passed through Calcutta, without regard for destination.

Clive Moore's history of the Melanesian community in the northern Queensland town of Mackay⁴⁵ relies less on quantitative analysis than Lal's study, and more on the collection and examination of oral testimony; but its findings, too, have the authority of being based on accumulated individual details. Data from the twenty-four surviving accounts of entire voyages were used, together with that from Corris's interviews with twelve exindentured laborers recorded in the late 1960s. In addition, 132 biographies, collected from kinsfolk in the 1970s, are presented, and the oral testimony is backed by computerized re-sorting of baptism, marriage, and death records. The study falls into a number of sections: an ethnography of the Malaitan context and a description of the recruiting process; the European context into which the Kanaka Maratta (laborers from Malaita) were placed; the working and private lives of the laborers; their community in the twentieth century, including such matters as self-perception and the role of the kidnapping myth in conditioning the outlook of the people. Of the three studies discussed, it is perhaps the one that comes closest to what the French would call "total history," largely because it deals with a whole

society rather than with a particular section. All, however, contain useful object lessons for historians concerned to write about the past of Pacific Islanders.

This paper has examined the application of a potentially negative fragmentation in the study of Pacific history. European historians over-emphasize the essential place of the study of European activity, and condescend somewhat toward the capabilities of Islander historians. The latter, in turn, assert the increasing irrelevance of the European orientation of Pacific history writing. I have argued that Pacific history, the past actions of the people of the Pacific Islands, is not only Island-centered but Islander-oriented. History writing must be based on this, by definition, but once accepted, such writing may be accomplished by anyone equipped with the techniques, and of an inclination to do so. It may acknowledge the value of studies of only part of the process by "building them in." In the final analysis, however, the Pacific historian will study the past of entire societies. The main concern will be the persistence or the change of structures through time, not merely those multicultural contexts involving Europeans. The main concern will be process rather than the surface sequence of events. Social categories will be emphasized rather than individuals, even if the way to an understanding of the category is through an accumulation of individual details.

I have suggested that there is much to be learned from the French school of total history, and that traditional documentary research must be complemented with quantitative analysis and the systematic use of oral testimony. In this way the qualms of those preoccupied with absolute chronology may be eliminated and the misgivings of those concerned about hard and fast lines between myth and history lessened (the more technically advanced work, in this respect, of our colleagues dealing with the African context is beginning to become more widely known).⁴⁶

A final point concerns the use of theory. Howe acknowledged the general reluctance of historians to theorize, but suggested that more use of the theory of social scientists was all that was necessary. Eric Hobsbawm, on the contrary, demanded that historians construct new models for themselves, rather than borrow "the meagre available models from other sciences."⁴⁷ He encouraged historians "to watch what we are doing, to generalize it, and to correct it in the light of the problems arising out of further practice."⁴⁸

It may be that I have suggested no more than that all available techniques and resources should be used in an integrated fashion and that

the special insights of Islander and non-Islander alike should be combined together rather than opposed to one another. Howe took the title of his recent book from Davidson's comparison of European penetration of the Pacific Islands with waves breaking on the shore without reaching the heartlands which are the cultures of the people.⁴⁹ I am suggesting that the point of view must now be of those who watch from the heartlands as the waves fall, rather than of those who come with the waves. In this way I am confident that the potentially destructive fragmentation presently threatening may be avoided.

David Routledge
University of the South Pacific

NOTES

1. J. W. Davidson, *The Study of Pacific History: An Inaugural Lecture Delivered at Canberra on 25 November 1954* (Canberra, 1955). The lecture was reprinted as "Problems of Pacific History," *Journal of Pacific History* 1 (1966): 5-21, from which references are taken.

2. J. W. Davidson, "History, Art or Game? A Comment on 'The Purity of Historical Method,'" *New Zealand Journal of History* 5, no. 2 (1971): 117.

3. Steve Britton, review of *Brown or White? A History of the Fiji Sugar Industry, 1878-1973* by Michael Moynagh, *New Zealand Journal of History* 16, no. 1 (1978): 78-79.

4. Davidson, "Problems of Pacific History," 5.

5. *Ibid.*, 8, 18.

6. *Ibid.*, 21.

7. Davidson commented on these early studies in footnotes to the 1966 version of his inaugural lecture.

8. J. W. R. Smail, "On The Possibility of an Autonomous History of Modern Southeast Asia," *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 2, no. 12 (1961): 72-102; also William R. Roff, *The Origins of Malay Nationalism* (New Haven, 1967), and Emily Sadka, *The Protected Malay States, 1874-1895* (Kuala Lumpur, 1968).

9. Peter Munz, "The Purity of Historical Method: Some Sceptical Reflections on the Current Enthusiasm for the History of Non-European Societies," *New Zealand Journal of History* 5, no. 1 (1971): 2, 17.

10. Davidson, "Art or Game," 116-117.

11. H. E. Maude, "Beachcombers and Castaways," in *Of Islands and Men: Studies in Pacific History* (Melbourne, 1968), and *The Evolution of the Gilbertese Boti: An Ethno-historical Interpretation* (Wellington, 1963).

12. R. W. Firth, *History and Traditions of Tikopia* (Wellington, 1961).
13. Greg Dening, *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land, Marquesas 1774-1880* (Melbourne, 1980).
14. O. H. K. Spate, "The Pacific as an Artefact," in Niel Gunson, ed., *The Changing Pacific: Essays in Honour of H. E. Maude* (Melbourne, 1978), 42-43.
15. Noel Rutherford, review of *Church and State in Tonga: The Wesleyan Methodist Missionaries and Political Development, 1822-1875* by Sione Lātūkefu, *Historical Studies* 17, no. 66 (1976): 111; K. R. Howe, "The Fate of the 'Savage' in Pacific Historiography," *New Zealand Journal of History* 11, no. 2 (1977): 152-154.
16. See, for example, "Pacific Personality. Samoa's Albert Wendt: Poet and Author, Interviewed by Marjorie Crocombe," *Mana Annual of Creative Writing* (Suva, 1973), 46; David Routledge, "Decolonizing Pacific History," address to the Fiji Society, 30 October 1979, *Proceedings of the Fiji Society*, 1979.
17. K. R. Howe, "Pacific Islands History in the 1980s: New Directions or Monograph Myopia?" *Pacific Studies* 3, no. 1 (1979): 84.
18. J. M. R. Young in the *National Times*, 8 September 1979. See also my review of *The Changing Pacific: Essays in Honour of H. E. Maude*, another Canberra collection of essays, *Journal of Pacific Studies* 4 (1979): 84-94.
19. O. H. K. Spate, *The Pacific since Magellan*, vol. 1, *The Spanish Lake* (Canberra, 1979), ix.
20. Spate, "The Pacific as an Artefact," 43.
21. Howe, "Pacific Islands History in the 1980s," 88.
22. K. R. Howe, *Where the Waves Fall: A New South Sea Islands History from First Settlement to Colonial Rule* (Sydney, 1984).
23. *Ibid.*, xiv.
24. See H. E. Maude, "Pacific History—Past, Present and Future" (*Journal of Pacific History* 6 [1971]: 3-24, an article based substantially on the author's presidential address to the History Section of "the first meeting of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the advancement of Science to be held in the Pacific Islands"), 3; D. J. N. Denoon, "People's History," *Inaugural Lecture, University of Papua New Guinea* (Port Moresby, 1973).
25. E. H. Carr, *What is History?* (London, 1961), particularly Lecture 1.
26. Sir George Clark, "General Introduction: History and the Historian," *New Cambridge Modern History*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1957), xx-xxi.
27. For a general treatment, see David C. Gordon, *Self-determination and History in the Third World* (Princeton, 1971); for a Pacific example, see Peter France, *The Charter of the Land: Custom and Colonization in Fiji* (Melbourne, 1969).
28. Denoon, "People's History"; Maude, "Pacific History—Past, Present and Future," 23 (referring to the South Pacific Commission's refusal to set up a committee of Pacific historians).

29. See, in particular, Davidson, *Samoa mo Samoa: The Emergence of the Independent State of Western Samoa* (Melbourne, 1967), a brilliant exercise in participant history, in which the author remained conscious of his status as an outsider and the need to observe the actions of which he was part with academic detachment; and his portrait of Lauaki Mamoe, one of the most important political chiefs in late nineteenth-century Samoa, "Lauaki Namulau'ulu Mamoe: A Traditionalist in Samoan Politics," in J. W. Davidson and Deryck Scarr, eds., *Pacific Island Portraits* (Canberra, 1973) 267-299.
30. See the obituary of J. W. Davidson by Francis West, *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 2, no. 1 (1973): 117.
31. Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *The Peasants of Languedoc* (trans. John Day, Illini Books edition, Chicago, 1976), 284.
32. Fernand Braudel, "History and the Social Sciences: The *Longue Durée*," in *On History* (trans. Sarah Matthews, Chicago, 1980), 25-54.
33. In addition to *The Peasants of Languedoc*, see Montaillou: *The Promised Land of Error* (trans., Barbara Bray, New York, 1975).
34. J. M. R. Young, *National Times*, 8 September 1979.
35. E. Le Roy Ladurie, "The 'Event' and the 'Long Term' in Social History: The Case of the Chouan Uprising," in *The Territory of the Historian* (trans. Ben and Sian Reynolds, Chicago, 1979), 130.
36. David Routledge, "Religion and Politics in Oceania, 1780-1850," *Jurnal Sejarah, Universiti Malaya* 11 (1972-1973): 69-81, and "The Failure of Cakobau, Chief of Bau, to Become King of Fiji," in G. A. Wood and P. S. O'Connor, eds., *W. P. Morrell: A Tribute, Essays in Modern and Early Modern History Presented to William Parker Morrell, Professor Emeritus, University of Otago* (Dunedin, 1973), 125-139.
37. John Garrett, *To Live Among the Stars: Christian Origins in Oceania* (Suva, 1982), 6.
38. I have nearly completed a comparative analysis of these processes, working along the lines indicated.
39. Greg Denning, *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land, Marquesas 1774-1880* (Melbourne, 1980), 40-41.
40. Malama Meleiseā, *O Tama Uli: Melanesians in Samoa* (Suva, 1980); see also the review by Doug Munro, *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 91, no. 4 (1982): 631-636.
41. Meleiseā, *O Tama Uli*, 54.
42. Brij Lal, "Leaves of the Banyan Tree: Origins and Background of Fiji's North Indian Indentured Migrants, 1879-1916," Ph.D. thesis, Australian National University, 1980.
43. *Ibid.*, 343.
44. *Ibid.*, 22.
45. C. R. Moore, "Kanaka Maratta: A History of Melanesian Mackay," Ph.D. thesis, James Cook University of North Queensland, 1981.
46. See, for example, P. Pender-Cudlip, "Oral Traditions and Anthropological Analysis: Some Contemporary Myths," *Azania* 7, no. 1 (1972): 2-24; P. Stevens, Jr., "The Uses of

Oral Traditions in the Writing of African History," *Tarikh* 6, no. 1 (1978): 21-30; T. Spear, "Oral Traditions: Whose History?" *Journal of Pacific History* 16 (1981): 133-148.

47. E. J. Hobsbawm, "From Social History to the History of Society," in Felix Gilbert and Stephen R. Graubard, eds., *Historical Studies Today* (New York, 1973), 8.

48. *Ibid.*, 13.

49. Howe, *Where the Waves Fall*, 352.

BOOK REVIEW FORUM

Douglas Oliver, *Two Tahitian Villages: A Study in Comparison*. Laie, Hawaii: The Institute for Polynesian Studies, 1981. Pp. xiv, 557, illustrations. \$24.95.

Review: GREG DENING
UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

Douglas Oliver has something of the scholastic philosopher in him. I wince to think of his comment on my saying that, but I mean it as a compliment. His work has the quality of a summa, a rational and exhaustive exploration of carefully defined universes of knowledge. He has as well the other mark of a Thomas Aquinas, a belief that, in the end, knowledge is awareness of the degrees of one's certainties. There are few scholars so precise and careful as Oliver in defining his own ambiguities, not out of false humility but out of confidence in logic, the weighing of evidence, and common sense. In that common sense lies a third scholastic quality: he is anthropological—he holds to universals in the human environment. Maybe that is not so much scholasticism as utilitarianism born of Adam Smith and Jeremy Bentham, pragmatism born of William James, a conviction that whatever their relative expression, human passions and human needs are everywhere recognizable.

There are other distinguishing qualities of his work. His studies are monumental. I do not mean large, although they are that, and Oliver will often tease his readers with his lengthiness. He has some disdain for the present expressed in its trends and fads. He does not bother with reflexive debate, although in this volume he refers rather ruefully to the

silence that greeted his early forays into reflection on ethnographical method. He admires monumental work of the past and he himself writes for the future. He dedicated that most monumental of all Pacific works, *Ancient Tahitian Society*, to Raymond Firth, Kenneth Emory, and John Beaglehole. I would guess he did so because he admires their precise scholarship, but I would also say that it was because he conceives of learning and scholarship as service to ends beyond present recognition. He delights in what others have done well because they make museums of knowledge in which he can learn. His own work is exhaustive, encyclopedic, because he writes not so much for readers as for libraries, and wishes the future his own joy in discovering what someone else bothered to record. This is not nostalgia to put down on paper cultures that are inevitably disappearing. Douglas Oliver is not a nostalgic man, unless it be for the world of the classic medieval historian. It is an epistemological stand. There is for him a permanence in knowledge that is an end in itself.

One would have to add that there are few ethnographers as precisely historical as he. Perhaps contextual or environmental might be better words than historical. I mean there are few ethnographers who are as ready to describe cultures as they actually are in the time and space in which they are observed. It is the occupational hazard of ethnography to blinker out the Coca-Cola cans and to distil what is "native" from the twentieth-century brew of their cultures. Douglas Oliver pays his Tahitian villagers the compliment of being interested in who they actually are. He has no illusions that he has discovered the quintessential Tahitian. In the old debate between Dominicans and Jesuits about the real distinction between essence and being, Oliver is the Jesuit: there is no such real distinction. The Tahitian villagers *are* what they are observed to *do*. They might not do the same, two villages away. They might not do the same tomorrow that they did yesterday. They might not do unobserved what they do observed. His description catches them circumstantially, not in models.

All the characteristics that have marked Douglas Oliver's style are present in *Two Tahitian Villages*—the self-deprecatory honesty, the realism touched with a little breezy cynicism, the structured measured progress through the problem, the whimsical examples. Self-denial in reflection goes a little further this time, however. It is relegated to an appendix in the last pages of a 550-page book. Published nearly thirty years after the fieldwork on which it is based, the book has a sense of obligation to his students, his colleagues, and himself hanging heavily over it. The brilliant achievement of *Ancient Tahitian Society* has come

between the beginning and the end of this work. It lacks the immediacy of *A Solomon Island Society* and the economic liveliness of *Pacific Islands*. I have to say that despite the vigorousness with which he pursues the comparative method, his refusal to say what he thinks it means in relationship to wider issues is maddening to those who have a greater confidence in his wisdom than he.

I have a sense of *pietas* toward Douglas Oliver. He is my mentor, I his student. I have in any case a very negative attitude toward reviews and reviewing. I find reviews, and my own temptation in reviewing, to be skeptical rather than critical. Reviewers are more inclined to want authors to have written a different book closer to the reviewer's talents and interests than to be critically appreciative of what the writer has done within the self-imposed limitations of any study. I take the stance, then, of this journal to be constructive. It produces for the author the opportunity to create something new in addition to the book that is now launched and over whose reading the author has now lost all control. Skeptically speaking, I could never write a book like *Two Tahitian Villages*. Ethnography for me is much more fictional and existential. It is fictional, an artifact, something made. It is the experience of observation translated into the medium of the book. It portrays rather than lays out a culture. And whatever its permanence, it inevitably speaks to a very particular discourse. It is a sentence in a conversation anthropologists, humanists, are having about something much wider than the time and place in which it is begun. I, the student, want of Oliver, the master, not a response to my compliments or my skepticism, but his reflections on the state of the art of ethnography and a rationale of his distinctive descriptive structures. My own students have responded marvelously to the descriptive structures of *Ancient Tahitian Society*: they have no complaints, like petulant reviewers, about its vocabulary. They are entranced by its clarity. They will not, I think, grasp those structures too clearly in *Two Tahitian Villages*. I would like them to have a crib on Oliver by Oliver.

Review: F. ALLAN HANSON
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

The two villages of the title are given the pseudonyms Fatata and Atea. The former is located on Mo'orea and the latter on Huahine. (Oliver stretches the term "Tahitian" to cover the Society Islands as a whole.) The Polynesians of these villages manifest neither the easy insouciance of Margaret Mead's Samoans nor the taut anxiety and hos-

tility of those same Samoans when viewed through Derek Freeman's eyes. If Society Islanders suffer from anything, it seems to be boredom in a humdrum existence that they themselves characterize as "narrow, monotonous, and stale" (497).

Local ennui did not deter Oliver, who found enough to say from his 1954–1955 fieldwork to fill more than 500 pages. His strategy is to undertake "controlled comparison" of the two communities, attempting on the broad base of similarity between them to pinpoint reasons for their relatively few differences. Oliver focuses particularly on economic life and, within that, on the role of money in the two villages. There is more of it in Fatata than in Atea, and that, coupled with other consequences of Fatata's greater proximity to the urban center of Pape'ete, Tahiti, turns out to be responsible for most of the observed differences between the villages.

Oliver is an ethnographer of uncommon candor. On numerous occasions he acknowledges that he did not collect the data necessary to a satisfactory resolution of the issue at hand. His reasoning, he complains, is sometimes tautologous (e.g., 504, 505) and has a "Euclid-like tread" (502). He confides further that his explanations of the differences between Fatata and Atea span the entire distance from "the clearly obvious through the plausibly likely to the wild-shot guess," instancing as an example of guesswork his suggestion that the frequency of neolocal residence is higher in Atea than in Fatata because houses tend to be smaller in the former village (524). One can sympathize with a certain frustration that probably fuels these admissions, especially when it is recognized that he gamely tries to account for virtually every difference in social and economic life for which he has data. Who would not tear their hair trying to explain, as Oliver does, why households that contain just one adult predominate in Atea, two-adult households in Fatata, three-adult households in Atea again, four-adult households in Fatata, while the villages do not differ with respect to households containing five or more adults (509)? It might be as well, and certainly more conducive to the analyst's peace of mind, simply to let facts such as these lie without explanation, especially since the numbers are so small that the differences may not be significant anyway.

On the other hand, at a few points Oliver might have been a good deal more expansive in his analyses. This is particularly true in the Postscript, where he confronts the issue of why, following the 1958 referendum on whether French Polynesia was to remain associated with France or become independent, Atea experienced a great deal of internal dissension while Fatatan society was essentially unruffled by the

event. This circumstance is surprising because in 1954–1955, when Oliver did the initial fieldwork for the book, Atea had appeared to be the more cohesive and stable of the two communities. Oliver's explanation: "the factor of *distance* [presumably distance from Pape'ete; he does not elaborate]—which accounted for much of Atea's relatively tighter prereferendum cohesiveness, accounted also for much of its more divided postreferendum falling apart" (529). He leaves the subject at that, with no account of how these opposite results can be derived from the same condition.

Among inter-village differences, Oliver found Atea to enjoy a higher degree of cooperation between households than Fatata, both in terms of informal mutual aid and exchange of surplus food, as well as in the prevalence of organized cooperative work groups (*pupu*). His explanation for this revolves around money: in both villages people are more willing to share goods and services generated directly by labor than those secured by money. Because money plays a larger role in Fatata's economy than in Atea's, there is less inter-household cooperation in Fatata (511). The situation on another French Polynesian island—Rapa, in the Austral group—may be instructive here. Of Rapa's two villages, Ha'urei and 'Area, I found there to be more inter-household cooperation in the latter. Money was not a significant variable, there being no distinguishable difference between the predominantly subsistence economies of the two villages on that score. Ha'urei, however, had an appreciably higher proportion of extended family households than 'Area did. My analysis was that an extended-family household is more self-sufficient than a nuclear-family household, because its larger labor force enables it simultaneously to accomplish the variety of tasks necessary in Rapa's economy. On any given day, one man may go fishing, another may prepare a new taro garden or work on house maintenance, one or two women may cultivate and harvest taro, another can prepare the meals, clean the house, and look after small children, and so on. Nuclear-family households are less able on their own to accomplish this variety of tasks, many of which must be done in widely separated locations. However, it is possible for them to benefit from different jobs if they share the fruits of their labor with other households. This analysis may apply to Oliver's material as well because, as in the Rapan case, he found extended-family households to be more prevalent in Fatata, which had less inter-household cooperation, than in Atea. At least as important, a household dependent on money, be it composed of a nuclear or extended family, is more able to acquire the desired *range* of goods and services than is a household dependent on the subsistence

labor of its members because it can have them by the relatively quick means of purchase. Therefore money is indeed significant to the difference in inter-household cooperation between Fatata and Atea, but not, I would suggest, for Oliver's reason that people are more selfish about things connected with money. Instead, it may be because households more deeply involved in a money economy are more self-sufficient in acquiring the goods and services of daily life and so have less need of the benefits of inter-household cooperation.

The cultures of the two villages are presented piecemeal rather than as organized systems. This is particularly clear in chapter 12, where the explanations for the differences between the villages take the form of a numbered list. Certain explanatory factors, such as Atea's greater distance from Pape'ete, occur repeatedly in the list, but that does not knit the diverse explanations together, nor does it provide a sense of these societies as structured wholes.

Two Tahitian Villages lacks an index—an unfortunate omission for any book as large and information-packed as this one is. Indeed, such a full account of social and economic organization in Fatata and Atea is given that this book should serve as a useful source of comparative data for other studies of contemporary village life in Polynesia and elsewhere.

Review: PAUL SHANKMAN
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER

Douglas Oliver's *Two Tahitian Villages* is at once direct and overwhelming. It is descriptive ethnography on a scale that most ethnographers cannot sustain. It is not embellished description or "thick description," but rather straightforward, meticulous, honest, and unpretentious description. *Two Tahitian Villages* is a labor of love, or more precisely, a labor of dedication. Oliver has modestly and correctly assessed his contribution, stating that "a description of a unique and vanished way of life, however small in scale and however inconsequential to the rest of the present day world, will always have some value in the future's Museum of the Human Experience" (xiii).

Oceanists who take the time to wade through this very sizable ethnography will appreciate Oliver's careful eye and his candor. Although his emphasis is on the economic aspects of Tahitian life, I particularly enjoyed the chapters on marriage and passing through life. He has admirably captured the two villages in his study—Atea and Fatata—at a particular moment in time. Although that moment has now passed,

Oliver resists the temptations of the ethnographic present as well as other anthropological devices that distance the reader from reality. *Two Tahitian Villages* lacks the lyricism of Robert Levy's *Tahitians*. Nor is it as engaging as Ben Finney's *Polynesian Peasants and Proletarians*. What we have here is old-fashioned, no-nonsense ethnography.

The fact that Oliver has strategically limited what he sets out to do in *Two Tahitian Villages* makes criticism of the book very difficult. For example, these two villages were among eight different Tahitian communities researched by Oliver's Harvard-based Society Islands project. But Oliver makes little use of the other studies done by Levy, Finney, Antony Hooper, Paul Kay, and Richard Moench, preferring instead to concentrate on the similarities and differences between Atea and Fatata. He anticipates someday combining observations about all eight communities within a single comprehensive framework, but for now that project will have to wait (xii).

One cannot fault Oliver for his sense of priorities. Writing a 557-page monograph would be the work of a lifetime for most cultural anthropologists. On the other hand, Oliver has as one of his objectives a demonstration of the usefulness of the method of controlled comparison. While he clearly has superb control over the villages of Atea and Fatata, the method employed seems to be one of "compare-and-contrast" rather than the use of the range of controls available from all eight communities.

Some of the tantalizing questions that Oliver raises about land use, households, and other topics could benefit from more systematic comparison with other Tahitian communities. So, in his final chapter, Oliver briefly mentions the differential response of Atea and Fatata to the same external political stress (526–529). Data from other Tahitian communities might help clarify why the two villages responded differently.

Other kinds of comparisons would also help. As Oliver notes, Atea and Fatata seem to be on a continuum of change. While this continuum rests on an unproven assumption (according to Oliver), comparison with the other six Tahitian communities might provide controls for testing such an assumption. The peasant-proletarian distinction that Finney uses might be one way of further organizing the data, making it comparable to other Oceanic societies. But again, Oliver reiterates his objective: "it is my limited purpose in this monograph to compare the economies of two small village societies *one* with the *other*, and not with *all other* societal economies, or *any other* known societal economy" (xiv, original emphasis).

For the economic anthropologist, *Two Tahitian Villages* is a mine of data. Yet even with his economic emphasis, Oliver eschews theory. Since much that passes for theory in economic anthropology, including the formalist-substantivist debate, is only marginally relevant to ethnography, this is understandable. But what of other theories concerning incipient economic stratification, or narrowing spheres of exchange, or increasing monetization and commercialization, or peasantization and proletarianization? These are not particularly controversial and could prove valuable frameworks for analyzing Oliver's Tahitian material.

Because *Two Tahitian Villages* is so empirically oriented and because its author has been so careful in delimiting his task, the book is not easily reviewed. It is a book that deserves to be read rather than summarized, which would be an impossibility in any case. The patient reader will be well rewarded, but on completion may feel as one does after the proverbial Chinese meal—hungry half an hour later. In this case, the hunger is for more theory, more comparison, and more generalization. Although this may seem like an unreasonable request to a man whose many and diverse contributions have already left their imprint on Oceanic scholarship, one can only hope that Douglas Oliver will provide a companion study to complement his meticulous ethnography.

Response: DOUGLAS OLIVER
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

I must commence this response with an admission: I found the Tahitians I lived among most engaging as individuals, but their institutions very dull (one of the several reasons why Robert Levy's *Tahitians* is so much more interesting than *Two Tahitian Villages*). As individuals, most of them—especially the older ones—stood out sharply, like large, roughly-sculpted, granite figures on a flat landscape. (In their own rural settings, that is; in the European-Chinese ambience of Papeete they seemed to me to shrink and lose shape—a poignant reminder of their actual and self-conscious marginality in the colonial scene.) However, the division of labor that Levy and I agreed upon—for good and obvious reasons—led him to focus on and write about individuals, and me about institutions. And in my case, since most of those institutions were about as exotic as Coca-Cola, I spent much of the time doing things like listing choir-practice attendance and noting who got soused at weddings—which of course is a necessary part of *controlled comparison* but was for me a tedious routine. (Doubtless, a deplorable attitude

in an ethnographer, but the reflection of a life-long preference for ethnology over sociology.)

However, before indulging in any more self-revelations let me address some of the criticisms aimed by the reviewers at my "large" ("overwhelming," "old-fashioned," etc.) book. I begin with Allan Hanson's, the most explicit of the three.

First is his commonsensical reminder that some differences between the two villages (in this case the size and composition of households) involved numbers too small to worry about. Having been schooled during the pre-statistical era of ethnology, I did indeed "worry" about all differences, however small—but not to the point of tearing my hair (of which there is little left to tear).

There is also truth in his charge that I was not "expansive" enough in my analysis at certain points, specifically regarding the different ways in which the villages reacted to the 1958 referendum concerned with relations with metropolitan France. In fact, the Postscript in which that event was mentioned was intended not as a source of new information, and hence requiring more explanation, but as a caveat regarding premature explanation based on short-term observation. An analysis of that particular event and its consequences would have required far more pages than I was prepared to add to an already over-long manuscript. My mistake was in offering any explanation at all—especially one as cryptic as that which Dr. Hanson justifiably objects to.

Next, in his discussion about the relations between household size, inter-household exchange, and involvement in the money economy, he is, I believe, correct in proposing a direct correlation between the first two (i.e., the larger the household the less its *need* for and practice of inter-household exchange, regardless of the money factor). Also, there is good logic in his point that households with more money have less *need* to engage in inter-household exchange. Nonetheless, I continue to believe that a *mental attitude* was also an important factor in the equation—that one village's longer and deeper involvement in the money economy of French Polynesia helped to foster a generally negative attitude (i.e., toward extra-household *gemeinschaft*) that included, for example, disdain for cooperative, mutual-aid work groups ("too bumpkinly") and disinclination for inter-household exchange ("unbalanced reciprocity makes for bad blood"). I would not characterize the latter as "selfishness," as Dr. Hanson does, but rather as a higher value placed on autonomy and privacy.

Dr. Hanson's fourth criticism concerns what he calls my "piecemeal"

presentation of the villages' institutions—my failure to treat them as "organized systems" or "structural wholes." I am somewhat puzzled by this charge. He is, of course, correct in stating that I described and compared one institution at a time; but I cannot for the life of me see how one can discuss the *connections* between parts before describing the parts themselves. Moreover, I did in fact compare the villages in terms of the size and pervasiveness of their kin networks, and in terms of the connections between the personnel and organization of their church parishes, their governmental administration, and their political parties (499–502). And while those networks and connections may not add up to "organized systems" or "structured wholes," they are about as far as I could have gone, analytically, without resorting to (esthetically pleasing but semantically empty) metaphor.

Dr. Hanson's fifth criticism, leveled at the book's lack of an index, is well deserved. All I can offer in extenuation is that the organization of the book is so relentlessly and systematically "piecemeal" that any reader seeking information on *anything* should soon know where to look. Also, I must confess, by the time the thing was written and rewritten, typed and retyped, proofread and re-proofread, etc., etc., I had neither the will nor the energy to prepare an index for it—and am of the opinion that an index for an ethnography prepared by anyone but the author has limited usefulness. (Apropos which, I have been intrigued—amused, bemused, etc.—by the fact that for several of the reviewers of my book, its most noteworthy feature has been its lack of an index. Perhaps my next one should consist of an *index* to which can be added a text.)

Turning to Paul Shankman's more indulgent remarks, they seem to boil down to a mild reproach—that I did not do *more* with the data than I did, that I did not combine them with *other* data, from other places and other times, to construct hypotheses of wider application (and of greater interest to readers like himself!). All I can say, in answer to this amicable complaint, is that I share his judgment about the theoretical aridity of the book; it is not one I would recommend to someone searching for anthropology's Great Ideas. On the other hand, I would not, out of modesty, be reluctant to prescribe it as an antidote to the bold claims still being made about "the comparative method" in particular, and about anthropological "science" in general.

Which reminds me, none of these three reviews (nor any others about the book that I have seen) has made more than passing reference to my application of "controlled comparison," which, after all, was the *raison d'être* of the whole exercise. Was it applied correctly or not? Did its

findings add anything to what is already known about cultural process? Is it worth pursuing in other places? And so on. Dr. Shankman suggests—one feels almost consolingly—that extension of the comparisons to the six other Tahitian communities included in the larger project *might* generate more hunger-satisfying (i.e., less Chinese cuisine-type) theory. Perhaps so; but extension of “comparison” to a wider and more varied universe inevitably reduces “control”—so where is the line to be drawn?

Greg Denning’s friendly remarks prompt me to wear my glasses when I next look into a mirror. They seem to combine an appreciation for what I am (i.e., what I have written), with good-natured vexation that I am not something else.

I am of course grateful for the appreciation, and flattered to be linked with the likes of A. Smith, J. Bentham, and W. James. Also, I am deeply moved, really, by his “confidence” in my “wisdom,” but am uncertain what that wisdom is—except that “it,” as represented in my writings, is not something he himself wishes to emulate! I, on the other hand, *do* wish I possessed the ability to compose a book like his *Islands and Beaches*.

Along with my gratitude, I feel some sorrow that I vex him—“madden” him, in his words—by what he calls my “refusal to say [what I think about my exercise in comparison] in relationship to wider issues.” Dear me; I thought I had done so, namely:

It has been claimed by some of its proponents that, because of anthropology’s inability to conduct sufficiently controlled *experiments*, controlled *comparison* is the sole means at its disposal to arrive at “scientific,” universally valid generalizations about cultural process. I am not convinced that this is so—or, for that matter, that *any* research method heretofore proposed or practiced is capable of producing such generalizations—but controlled comparison appears to be a method worth devoting more effort to. (xi)

As for my attempt to formulate a scheme for describing the *economics* of a whole community in general (Appendix), and of an individual’s life cycle in particular (391–400), I am left to conclude that in his judgment it either does not touch on “wider issues,” or that, out of kindness to myself, the least said about it the better.

But perhaps our notions differ about what those “wider issues” are. To me, as a matter of priority, they have to do with ethnographies themselves: first, with making them fuller, more faithful representations of

various distinctive ways of life; and secondly, doing so objectively and in language that will permit them to be compared one with another. The first goal springs from a conviction about the paramount importance—the necessity—of recording as fully as possible as many distinctive cultures as possible. This I consider to be a sufficient goal in itself, one that does not require any other justification. (When voiced by some anthropologists, the judgment “just another ethnography” connotes disparagement; in fact, the production of any honest ethnography is a commendable act.) The second, largely instrumental, goal I refer to involves an ambiguity more easily stated than resolved. While I acknowledge the difficulty, perhaps in some cases the impossibility, of describing the institutions of cultures in a language (e.g., English, French, etc.) other than their own, I nevertheless believe that the attempt must be made, in the hope—not very sanguine—that someone, someday may be able to construct wider generalizations about mankind’s institutions by means of comparison, controlled or otherwise.

I infer from Denning’s statement that he also is in search of those “wider generalizations” (and is more sanguine about discovering them). In addition—to his greater credit—his attempts to discover them are more *direct* in that he employs each of his own ethnographies as a straight path to the goal. There is no way of foretelling which of the two approaches will reach the goal first—or whether the goal will ever be reached! But even if it is not, the products of both approaches will prove to be worthwhile. The *Islands and Beaches* approach will continue to provide engrossing and thought-provoking documents for anyone interested in the human condition. And the Just-Another-Ethnography approach will provide irreplaceable information about the human past.

REVIEWS

Ahmed Ali, Ron Crocombe, and Ronald Gordon, eds., *Politics in Polynesia*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 1983. Pp. xii, 262, photos, maps, bibliography, index. F\$ 5.00.

Politics in Polynesia is the second volume in a three-volume series on political development in the Pacific islands. Consisting of eleven essays authored by expatriates and Pacific islanders alike, this volume attempts to provide an understanding of a politically fragmented region from the "inside perspective of a person of that country." Perhaps the most salient feature of Polynesia is its range of political character from the traditional to the metropolitan, with all the permutations of such a broad spectrum.

Emiliana Afeaki's "Tonga: The Last Pacific Kingdom" focuses on traditional social roles and relationships in Tonga where there is a "general acceptance of the belief that nobility and royalty are divinely preconditioned as social/government leaders" and where "the people's representatives are not only too few in number, but according to popular view . . . often not the most suitable for the job as the people are often not well prepared for voting." Hereditary claim to traditional elite status and the ability to provide others with access to limited land resources are the two major sources of power in the islands, though access to education is quickly becoming an alternative avenue for commoners to rise to positions of authority and influence.

Western Samoa, described by Malama Meleisea and Penelope Schoffel as a "slippery fish," is a curious blend of constitutionalism and traditionalism. In spite of the influences of previous colonial administra-

tions, government and politics represent a bold compromise between the traditional elites and the "families and ordinary people who are the majority of Samoa's population." Indeed, the present status of Western Samoan political structure has been the result of a nine-year period of "cautious consolidation of the internal administration and the economy." The influence of the Apia merchant community is being felt through its support of political candidates by the distribution of food and liquor to constituents. The influence of nontraditional interest groups has been responsible in part for "considerable discussion and debate about the merits of electoral reform." It is, however, difficult for any government to achieve a solid base of popular support, particularly when power is exercised by an aging minority of chiefs.

American Samoa, on the other hand, is probably the "best example of how a territory can grow politically without a plan." After over half a century of benign neglect by the American Congress, abundant political advances have come about, advances that, according to Fofu Sunia, could not have materialized without corresponding advances in the standard of living. The elected offices of governor and delegate to Congress were important by-products of renewed political interest in the island territory. The legislature has become "much like those in the other U.S. states and territories," especially since the competition for seats has become both serious and expensive. In an ideological sense, American Samoa is both American and Samoan with all the attendant benefits and contradictions.

French Polynesia and Wallis and Futuna are remarkable political contrasts in the French Pacific. Karl Rensch characterizes the latter and smallest of the French Pacific territories as a "total dependency," ruled from three sources of power. The kings of Alo, Sigave, and Wallis are the traditional rulers operating within the statutory institutions. As an overseas territory, the French administrator is the second source of authority, with veto power over legislative acts deemed contrary to metropolitan interests. The third source of power is considerably less formal. The local hierarchy of the Catholic Church continues to play a powerful role in politics, a fact that has carried over from the nineteenth century. While there are declared political parties, traditional respect for social rank, lineage, and seniority still affect the outcome of elections more than political issues. Although there is no independence movement, there is much concern over the future status of New Caledonia in the wake of Vanuatu independence, when many Wallisians returned to the islands. Should similar circumstances occur in New Caledonia, the islands would be unable to reabsorb an even greater

number of repatriates. Isolation has helped diminish its participation in regional affairs, a factor compounded by its small francophone population. Rensch concludes that these considerations and characteristics will not make Wallis and Futuna a major influence in the Pacific for the foreseeable future.

By comparison, French Polynesia has a more engaging political character. Termed a "nuclear colony" by Bengt Danielsson, the islands have "vegetated in a sort of cultural vacuum" and have become economically more dependent on France. Beginning with a useful review of recent political history, the author elaborates on the independence/autonomy movements and all the personalities who have made interesting copy over the last two decades. Lacking a traditional political elite, the Tahitians have established the party system as an integral part of political culture. The thrust of Danielsson's essay revolves around the political effects of the nuclear tests, which have had both local and regional ramifications for France. An ironic development of the political scenario was the recent triumph of the local Gaullists in the territorial assembly elections and the subsequent defeat of their national counterparts in parliament and the presidency. Danielsson confidently concludes that "genuine self-government will sooner or later lead to independence" for the islands, but that will depend on how quickly the present metropolitan government makes good on its promises.

Niue, the Cook Islands, and the Tokelaus still have formal political relationships with New Zealand. How each of these jurisdictions has proceeded in regional and international settings has followed a remarkable scenario exceeded only by the respective political evolution of each. In the Cooks, the party system has had considerable counter-productive results. While such a system may be suitable for metropolitan countries, "serious division in the community" has often resulted from differences in political alignments. The nature and results of the recent elections seem to support such an observation. Party politics has not been without historical antecedents. According to Pamela Pryor, New Zealand never fully prepared the Cook Islanders for self-government. The charismatic appeal and organizational abilities of Albert Henry placed the Cook Islands Party in power for thirteen years. In spite of the political defeat of the CIP, Henry managed to make a place for the Cooks in regional organizations and issues. In many instances, the Democratic Party under Thomas Davis's leadership has benefited from this, negotiating agreements and treaties with the United States and the Republic of Korea directly, without the participation of New Zealand.

Niue is an example of political development "marked by stability"

that is "second to none in the Pacific." While this has simply meant that Premier Robert Rex has been returned to power continuously since 1975, the political development of Polynesia's smallest independent state has been cautious and gradual. The Tokelaus are described as a "non-self-governing territory under New Zealand's administration." Such an administration is centered in Apia through the Office of Tokelau Affairs. Island currency is Western Samoan as well, which may in due course signal the final political affiliation of the islands.

Originally part of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands colony, Tuvalu's separation from the British protectorate in 1975 and its independence three years later was the fruit of protracted and emotional negotiations. Though the new republic has not adopted a formal party system, local politics revolves around the two principal political personalities, Tuari-pi Lauti and Tomari Puapua.

Hawaii and Rapanui have the distinction of being the only two Polynesian islands to have been fully decolonized through their complete integration into Pacific rim nations. As with Wallis and Futuna, little has been written on the politics of Rapanui. Grant McCall sees island politics as functioning separately on the local and national levels. While family and clan affairs dominate local politics, the armed forces control the course of national politics. Unlike other Chileans, the Rapanui accord a "different prestige" to the armed forces. Local needs, however, deviate little from those of their Polynesian neighbors and encompass improved education and transportation, and economic development. In Hawaii, according to Norman Meller, centralization of political, economic, and social activity has been the major characteristic underlying island life for over a century. The "newest element appearing in the Islands' political scene has been the emergence of various spokesmen of Hawaiian ancestry," a phenomenon similar to that occurring among the New Zealand Maori. The 1978 Hawaii State Constitutional Convention addressed some of the concerns of this developing political force by enacting a variety of measures, including the creation of a new state agency entrusted with the betterment of conditions of the native Hawaiians. Political parties in Hawaii, however, appear to be losing much of their former importance due to greater fragmentation of interest groups. Such a development "may unbalance Hawaii's extremely concentrated government and lead to further decentralization."

Since the various authors worked separately on their respective essays, it would have been appropriate if the editors had included a final entry drawing together some broad observations and conclusions

concerning the overall political development in Polynesia. Nevertheless, this inexpensive volume is perhaps the best work yet issued by the Institute of Pacific Studies. It is readable, even in quality, and useful to both student and scholar alike.

William E. H. Tagupa
Office of Hawaiian Affairs
State of Hawaii

Judith Binney, Gillian Chaplin, and Craig Wallace, *Mihaia: The Prophet Rua Kenana and His Community at Maungapohatu*. Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1979. Pp. 208, illustrated, index. \$33.00.

Peter Webster, *Rua and the Maori Millenium*. Wellington: Price Milburn for Victoria University Press, 1979. Pp. xii, 328, illustrations, maps, index, bibliography.

Prophetic movements and religious fervor in the Pacific are quite commonly associated with Melanesia. Yet Polynesia has had a significant history of prophets who have taken upon themselves the frequently awesome task of translating and mediating two opposing cultural traditions. In New Zealand, where there have been several such movements, the opposition and antagonism between Maori and European have become more, rather than less, complex over time. Moreover, the very fact that numerous individuals have undertaken, with varying but never complete success, the tasks involved in messianic leadership, indicates the shifting patterns of shadow and mutual illumination that have played across the colonial landscape.¹ To understand such events from the distance of several decades, to unravel the intricacies of revelation and intergroup rivalries, requires special skills. As Ivan Brady (1982: 185) has recently written:

History is a hard thing to know. Although visible in the present through cultural developments that have survived the past, history is still never quite known to us, perhaps ever knowable in the extreme. Its combination of mystification and material circumstance always holds point through our puzzling over it, and we know . . . that it must be interpreted to be understood.

Such analyses require an interpretation not so much of events but of meanings.² Indeed, the differences between Maori and European are perhaps nowhere more visible than in the context of Maori religious innovation. For the Maori, prophetic revelation offered a glimpse of salvation and equality in the face of European assertions of religious, political, and ultimately moral superiority. For the European, such divine disclosures pointed to the irrational underside of a native culture only dimly perceived or understood. More to the point in this volatile situation, such claims of supernatural guidance were interpreted by Europeans as challenges to their pretensions to dominion.

Judith Binney, a historian, and Peter Webster, an anthropologist, have each presented us with an account of Rua Kenana Hepetipa, an East Coast prophet who, in the early years of this century, took up the cause of and came to speak for thousands of the most conservative Maoris, the Tuhoe people of the Ureweras. These books are very different, however, reflecting more than the predictable disparity between disciplines.

Binney's previous research on the life of Thomas Kendall, an Anglican missionary, and Papahurihia, one of the earliest Maori prophets, has considerably illuminated our understanding of the early years of religious contact. This study of Rua may be seen quite readily as a continuation of work already well done. Originally Binney, in collaboration with Gillian Chaplin and Craig Wallace, had planned a photographic history, but as she tells us, "it has grown in unexpected ways."

Peter Webster has based his book on his dissertation, "Maungapohatu and the Maori Millenium," for which he did fieldwork in the Ureweras beginning in 1964. It is obvious that Binney and Webster have not collaborated. Binney tells us:

Since 1971 the thesis has been closed and despite a personal request to the author, I have not been permitted to read it. However, just before writing this introduction, I learned that it is to be published under the title *Rua and the Maori Millenium*. Although I regret Dr. Webster's decision, the publication of two discrete studies of Rua in the same year certainly adds spice to New Zealand historiography.

That is of course not all they add.

Until the simultaneous publication of these books in 1979, little was known of Rua. Both of these books are welcome and needed additions to the documentation of Maori prophetic movements. Binney's and Web-

ster's approaches are so different, however, that we learn different things from each; only the outlines of Rua's life and career remain constant.

Rua, a young Tuhoe, worked in the early years of this century as a shearer and ditch digger for European farmers. His life and the lives of his people were transformed when Christ appeared to him and told him of a diamond buried deeply in Maungapohatu, the sacred mountain of the Tuhoe. Armed with his vision and his certainty of divine guidance, Rua announced that he was the new messiah. Within a year, he claimed that King Edward (then the reigning monarch of Great Britain) would come to New Zealand and, in exchange for the diamond of the Ureweras, restore the Maoris as the rightful owners of the country. A new age was to begin, and in its anticipation people were encouraged to sell their property and belongings. Binney (1979:26) points out that the transaction was to be both legal and logical: "The end to Pakeha [the Maori word for European] rule was to be achieved by simple expatriation, not by violence but by lawful royal purchase. The land which had been ceded by a Queen would be returned by a King."

When King Edward failed to arrive, much less to give New Zealand back to the Maoris, Rua announced that, after all, he was the king who would now lead his people. In 1907 he led four hundred followers to his New City, Maungapohatu, where he hoped to build a "habitation for God and man." In their midst were Rua's twelve disciples—the *riwaiti*. Based on the model of Christ's disciples and Moses' Levites, they studied scriptures and ministered to the people. For Rua, his followers were transformed; they were Ihairaira (Israelites), who like the Nazarites of the Old Testament wore long hair and abstained from tobacco and alcohol. Binney (1979:32) tells us:

Rua's claims in these first years varied. Many derived from Christian as well as Jewish teachings. He performed the miracle of feeding the multitude—with two "fifties" of flour. He called himself "the twelfth prophet" twelve being the sacred number of the tribes of Israel and of the house of Christ, in Te Turuki's [an earlier East Coast prophet, also known as Te Kooti] teachings. He was Moses, to whom God had given the tablets of the law. But the name which he finally took for himself was Hepzibah—Hepetipa—the daughter of Zion.

At Maungapohatu, Rua and his followers built a settlement that eliminated the problems of hygiene and sanitation that had so plagued

other Maori communities, endangering Maori health. Maori autonomy and self-sufficiency were clearly objectives of Rua's, but he did not turn his back on those aspects of European society that would be useful to his ends. Despite his distrust of the Pakeha, Rua realized that the solution to Maori difficulties resided, at least in part, in recognizing and accommodating the European presence.³ In fact his banner, "One Law for Both Peoples," expressed his determination that Europeans reciprocate by acknowledging Maori integrity rather than persisting in their policy of discrimination and depreciation.

The buildings in the community were a celebration of Rua's religious ideals and revelations. Hiona (Zion), Rua's courthouse and meeting house, was a two-story circular building decorated with playing card symbols, clubs and diamonds. Webster tells us virtually nothing about the symbolism of Rua's *wairua tapu* religion, while Binney interprets it wherever possible. There are of course wonderful photographs to go along with her detailed descriptions. Binney is very concerned with explicating Maori tradition and locating it in a particular historical context. As an example, she describes the symbols on Hiona (1979:48-49):

Playing card emblems were used in the nineteenth century as mnemonics to the Scriptures by those who could not read. . . . The Club was the emblem to stand for the King of Clubs. He is the King who is yet to come; the last King in the line of David, on the bloodline of the Lord. The kings in the other suits have been "played," but the King of Clubs is the coming King:⁴ Rua the Messiah.

Similarly, the diamond signified both the Holy Ghost and the diamond of Rua's early vision. "Hidden jewels, as here, often stand figuratively for knowledge or energy which is to be recovered and used for a specific purpose" (Binney 1979:49).

Rua ministered to both the secular and religious needs of the community. At its height Maungapohatu was well organized and productive. Rua abolished traditional sacred rules and deliberately violated many *tapus*. Like other Maori prophets, he simultaneously neutralized and acknowledged the power of ancestral spirits. Yet he maintained certain specific religious injunctions that reinforced the strict standards of hygiene he had established. Saturday was the Sabbath on which services similar to those of the Ringatu church (founded by Te Turuki) were held. But there were significant departures from the religion of the other great East Coast prophet that angered many of the people.

Rua attempted to unite the Tuhoe but instead divided them. To some he was the messiah, to others an unregenerate infidel. Wherever he went emotions ran high. It was inescapable that he would anger the Europeans, who could not ignore his independence and autonomy. In 1916 an armed mounted police force entered Rua's settlement. The prophet was taken prisoner and one of his sons killed. In the capture, trial, and sentencing of Rua, justice was ill served. By documenting these events, both Binney and Webster make an important contribution to New Zealand history.

The two books differ in range and scope. Webster's book takes the reader to 1918, Binney's study continues until the Prophet's death in 1937. Moreover, they each had access to different information and each took what she/he had gathered and used it to different ends. Webster, who started his research in 1964, was fortunate in being able to interview Reverend Laughton, who established the first mission station in Maungapohatu. Laughton's relationship with Rua was complicated and many sided, reflecting the complex personalities of each man and the structural intricacies that are inevitable when missionary and prophet confront one another. Webster was also able to interview Pemia, the youngest of Rua's wives. In addition, he details several of his fieldwork experiences, which allow the reader to understand the difficulties Webster faced as a European doing this kind of research. Nevertheless the reader never knows how close he was to the people. His information, when compared to Binney's, often seems sparse. Surprisingly, he and Binney seem to have talked to very few of the same people. Binney was extremely fortunate in the cooperation she received from both European and Maori sources. A major achievement was her acquisition of the papers and documents of Rua's defense counsel, J. R. London. Binney's study is that much more complete because she has had access to the only surviving record of the trial.

But the real debt, as Binney acknowledges, goes to the Maori people, who assisted her and ultimately transformed her efforts into a documentary, rather than a photographic, history. It is by listening to elders as they relived their experiences during those momentous times that Binney obtained a sense of the important differences between European and Maori perspectives. She writes:

In the course of carrying out research for this book, it became apparent that substantial differences existed between the published sources—mostly journalist's articles and contemporary Pakeha reports—and the Maori oral accounts and their manu-

script records of the same event. There is a real gap between Maori and European perceptions as the symbolic quality of thought belonging to the Maori world view shifts "reality" into forms unfamiliar to the European. At the same time, I found the elders with whom I talked very accurate in their knowledge, not only of events, but also surprisingly the dates of those events, many of which I could verify from written records.

Her relationship with the followers of Rua was clearly warm and intimate, for they revealed much to her. Yet she has the wisdom to realize that more than one interpretation is possible:

One day, a Maori—and I hope a Tuhoe will write a history of Rua, and it will be very different from this. I have tried to understand what I have been told, but in shaping the material in written form I have been conscious that I may be altering its values and the significance it has for the people with whom I talked.

Because she is a woman, Binney could talk freely to women who were able to reveal details of daily life in Maungapohatu, all of which are richly conveyed. Binney too is aware of the many sources of information to be had in any Maori community. In addition to oral accounts, there are ledgers, account books, and personal manuscripts, which many individuals keep to mark important events. Furthermore, Binney makes consistent efforts to use and to translate Maori, while Webster in his obvious discomfort with the language leaves much unmentioned. For example, Binney translates pages from a ledger, which allows us to see how the community was organized and how it functioned. In short, Binney appears justifiably humbled by the complexities of her task; Webster seems less in awe of the project he has undertaken.

Binney is clearly fearful of a biased interpretation; she presents and describes rather than analyzes much that transpired at Maungapohatu. By contrast, Webster shows no such inhibitions. For Webster, Rua's followers represent a millenarian movement whose dynamics can best be understood by an explication of collective psychology. He is especially indebted to Neil Smelser's work on collective behavior for his interpretation of a Maori iconoclast.

There are several problems with this approach. Dr. Webster is attached to concepts such as alienation and deprivation, which are of

dubious explanatory value when applied to a defeated, dispossessed group. To say that they are deprived is to state only the obvious. Moreover, Maoris faced a moral, not a psychological dilemma. The use of psychological concepts to elucidate a social phenomenon requires great caution. For example, "anxiety" is difficult to ascertain eighty years later. Such an analysis ultimately depends too much on Western characterizations. In Webster's hands the results are ethnocentric and judgmental. He writes, in a typical passage:

It is therefore possible that the known external threat developed from a comparatively straightforward case of objective anxiety to include elements of frustration and the threat failed to mobilize the Tuhoe in a positive way. Instead their anxiety became blurred, and begins to include elements of free floating anxiety whose sources cannot be pinpointed and thus becomes neurotic.

Webster's chapter on theoretical orientations also includes a brief review of millenarian movements. It is in this context that he hopes to analyze Rua's prophetic message. Certainly Rua held out a vision to Maoris that was similar to those offered by other millenarian leaders. To the extent that anthropology seeks generalizations, this is an important point to make. But Rua was much more than one of a type. To represent him this way is ultimately to trivialize his movement and to miss the point of what he was trying to accomplish. If Webster was seeking comparative materials, he had only to investigate the tradition of Maori prophets that preceded Rua. Instead he writes only of Te Kooti. By failing to discuss the tradition to which Rua himself felt so linked, Webster must ignore the continuity that Rua posited between the past and the present. Thus as a faithhealer, Rua takes his place alongside other Maori religious leaders, including the traditional *tohunga*. To be effective in this realm is to deny that all power resides with the Pakeha. Yet Webster discusses faithhealing not in terms of Rua and the Tuhoe, but in terms of anxiety, reaction depression, and placebos.

Much of Webster's theoretical discussion is unnecessary. Although he attempts to evaluate the utility of a symbolic approach, he is not inclined in that direction. (On that score, it is a surprise to see no mention of Geertz in his bibliography.) Many of the points that were obviously in his dissertation would have been more effectively omitted in a book designed for a more general audience. Nevertheless, despite its problems the book is a valuable document of an important time in New Zealand history.

It is an effort for Binney, Webster, or the reader to be entirely dispassionate when confronted with the details of the police raid on Maungapohatu and Rua's subsequent trial. Binney and Webster both capture the prejudice, bigotry, and ignorance that his followers endured. In the face of this, it is not surprising that Rua failed; what was important was that he tried at all. Binney concludes: "Essentially Rua's dream had been a simple one: that the Tuhoe might survive. His millenium offered them the chance to build their city of God on their own lands. To lives which were otherwise bounded by quiet despair he brought hope that might 'show the heavens more just.' Who would deny them that?"

The tradition of prophecy that produced the prophet of the Ureweras has inspired subsequent leaders with visions that are now familiar, but no less compelling. So long as New Zealand society offers only inequality and misunderstanding to Maoris they will continue to turn to such leaders. But there are implications here that remain to be explored. Rua and other Maori prophets do more than mediate different social historical traditions; they are important creators of culture (Keesing 1982). For it is they who frame the symbolic dimensions of the contemporary Maori world. We cannot afford to ignore them but must be led, by people like Binney and Webster, to deeper levels of understanding.

Karen P. Sinclair
Department of Sociology
Eastern Michigan University

NOTES

1. Ivan Brady (1982:186) points out that to understand such situations, both colonizer and colonized must be studied. He writes, citing Geertz: "Where tribal history rests largely on the records of intruders, 'to know the native one must know the intruder' (Geertz 1973:346)."

2. Marshall Sahlins (1981:72) has recently argued that structuralism and history can be combined for a powerful analysis. He concludes his study by writing:

The dialectics of history then, are structural throughout. Powered by disconformities between conventional values and intentional values, between intersubjective meanings and subjective interests, between symbolic sense and symbolic references, the historical process unfolds as a continuous and reciprocal movement between the practice of structure and the structure of practice.

3. Binney (1979:24) writes:

For the Tuhoe to achieve some Pakeha living standards and to become self sufficient again, they had to retain economic control of their land. Rua sought to develop the wealth of the Tuhoe so that the land could be used for their own advantage. If his movement was founded on a very considerable distrust of Europeans and their material pursuits, it also sought to use some of their ideas and skills.

4. Binney (ibid.:49) tells us that "Rua claimed to be the 'mystic fourth' in a line of Maori prophets: Te Whiti, Titokowaru, and Te Turuki. Three had fallen, as prophesied, but the fourth would stand: the King of Clubs."

REFERENCES

- Judith Binney. 1966. "Papahurihia: Some Thoughts on Interpretation." *JPS* 75:321-331.
- . 1968. *The Legacy of Guilt: A Life of Thomas Kendall*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Ivan Brady. 1982. "Les Illes Marquises: Ethnography from Another Beachhead." *American Ethnologist* 9:185-190.
- Clifford Geertz. 1973. *The Interpretation of Culture*. New York: Basic Books.
- Roger Keesing. 1982. "Introduction." In *Rituals of Manhood*, G. Herdt, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Marshall Sahlins. 1981. *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities*. ASAO Special Publications, No. 1. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Gilbert Cuzent, *Archipel de Tahiti: Recherches sur les principales productions végétales*. Revised and expanded by Jacques Florence, Michel Gúerin, Francine and Daniel Margueron, Denise and Robert Koenig. Papeete, Tahiti: Editions Haere Po No Tahiti, 1983. Pp. 208, illustrations, index, bibliography.

The botany of the Pacific Islands, in a scientific sense, started in Tahiti in 1769 with the field work of Banks and Solander on Captain James Cook's first voyage around the world. Their *Prima Flora* was never published. The first paper on Pacific botany was a chapter on plants used by the Tahitians in the posthumously published journal of Sydney Parkinson, artist of the expedition, in 1773.

Since then numerous papers and several major works have appeared, treating in one way or another the plants of Tahiti and the rest of the Society Islands. Most of these were fairly unprofessional in nature, or if

professional, leaving much to be desired in quality. Exceptions were works of Nadeaud—which, however, suffered from the author's lack of access to herbarium and library facilities—and of Drake del Castillo, which suffered from the author's complete lack of field acquaintance with the plants of the Society Islands. Several treatments of Society Island plants have been published in the twentieth century, but for the most part these were neither complete nor of very high botanical quality.

Of the nineteenth-century works, one of the more interesting—but by no means professional—was a 275-page treatise entitled “Tahiti” published in 1860 by Gilbert Cuzent, a French naval pharmacist. This brought together the material from numerous previously published articles by the same author, to form an account of the geography, ethnology, and economic botany of the island. It includes a “Conspectus de la Flore de Tahiti,” one of the first attempts at a complete listing of the plants of Tahiti, based on the work of Pancher. This enumerates 532 species, of which 248 were considered introduced, the rest indigenous. This book has long been out of print and is of little help in identifying more than the most common plants of the island. It does contain much valuable information on the properties and uses of the plants, and is a principal source on then-current ethnobotany.

In 1983 appeared a “reedition” of Cuzent's work, “Revue et augmentée par Jacques Florence, Michel Guérin, Francine et Daniel Margueron, Denise et Robert Koenig.” Since this is the first properly published product of what appears to be a revival of local French interest in Polynesian botany, it seems appropriate to review it rather fully and critically and to provide comments and suggestions that may be of help and guidance for the development of this renewed interest in the flora. The book was published by Editions Haere Po No Tahiti, sponsored by the Société des Études Océaniques, Papeete, Tahiti.

The first main section of the book, entitled “Archipel de Tahiti,” is a series of eighteen essays on assorted geographical, historical, and social topics. These are fairly faithfully copied, though somewhat edited, from the corresponding section of the 1860 work. An attempt has been made, unfortunately, to change the plant names in this section to correspond to current usage.

By far the most valuable section is the second, “Recherches sur les Principales Productions Végétales de l'Ile.” This has chapters on kava, oils, resinous saps, gums, coloring materials, starches, “produits divers,” “cultures” (garden cultivations), and woods. Under these headings

many plants are discussed, some in considerable detail, others cursorily. The various treatments, totaling a considerable number of plant species (plus the pearl oyster), are transcribed rather faithfully, excepting, again, an attempt to substitute botanical names in current use for those used by Cuzent. The names used in this section are mostly correct, but it is unfortunate that the names used by Cuzent were not included in parentheses. For some species, analytical data apparently generated by Cuzent himself are given. He was clearly motivated by a firm belief that there were many valuable plants that could be profitably exploited to make the colony an economic asset to France. Both a preface and postface by Michel Guérin have been added to this section. The preface is a commentary on horticulture, past and present, Tahiti and the introduction of exotic economic species. The postface comments on Cuzent's agricultural and horticultural aims and the reasons why most of them came to naught.

The most botanically interesting chapter in this section of the original work—the “Conspectus de la Flore de Tahiti,” a list contributed by Pancher, government horticulturist—is not included in the 1983 edition. If critically annotated, this would have been an important botanical contribution.

Cuzent's Dictionnaire Français-Tahitien and accompanying “Dialogue” and astronomical legend, which conclude the 1860 work, are faithfully transcribed and are worthwhile contributions to our knowledge of the Tahitian language as spoken in 1860.

The remaining forty pages of the 1983 book consist of two “annexes,” plus an Index Général des Plantes, a short bibliography of works consulted, a list of original illustrations, acknowledgements, and table of contents.

The Annexe Botanique, by Jacques Florence, contains a short but informative account of the present botanical landscapes of Tahiti, the changes since Cuzent's time, and concern about the surge of exotics that are taking over the islands; remarks on naming a plant; a list of “correct” scientific names in the present book—a surprising proportion of them really correct, considering the resources available in Tahiti for work on plant nomenclature; a list of the authors of the plant names and their abbreviations; remarks concerning synonymy and a list of synonyms (names in the 1860 edition but changed in this one); and a lexicon of Tahitian plant names and their scientific equivalents. Unfortunately a few errors have crept into the list of “correct” names: for example, inclusion of both *Bombax ceiba* L. and *Ceiba pentandra* Gaertn.,

the former used in the chapter on kapok, the latter the actually correct name of the kapok; *Citrus aurantium* L. instead of *C. sinensis* (L.) Osb. for the sweet orange; *Citrus medica* L. instead of *C. aurantifolia* (Christm.) Swingle for the lime; *Physalis pubescens* for *P. peruviana*; *Vanilla planifolia* for the cultivated *Vanilla mexicana*, and so on.

No source has been given for the Tahitian names listed, whether they were compiled from the 1860 edition or collected from present-day sources. No attempt has been made anywhere in this "reedition" to account for the majority of botanical names used in the 1860 edition, which if critically done would have been the most useful feature in the book.

The Annexe Bibliographique (pp. 184–193) by Francine and Daniel Margueron, is one of the most important parts of this edition. It contains a biography of Gilbert Cuzent (1820–1891) including high points and many details that enable a reader to place this man and his work in the context of his time. A chronological table of his life is provided. Most important is a bibliography of "articles et ouvrages écrits par Cuzent sur l'Océanie," arranged according to the journals in which they were originally published, with dates. His article on kawa, in *Messager de Tahiti*, is reproduced in facsimile.

There remain to be pointed out the illustrations. The original book had almost none. Throughout the 1983 edition are scattered several maps and many appropriate reproductions of historical and landscape subjects from various sources, these carefully noted along with the pictures. Some are of great interest, giving a feeling of the landscapes of Cuzent's time and even earlier. Finally, distributed throughout the volume are eighteen magnificent original drawings of important plants, native and exotic, by Guy Wallert, a local artist. These are a major contribution to the work. The drawing of the kava (*Piper methysticum*) has also been reproduced on the front cover.

To conclude, obviously an enormous amount of work went into this publication. It is, however, a pity that the original text of Cuzent was not reproduced exactly, with original pagination, and the corrections clearly separated from but carefully correlated with the original. The 1860 book is so rare that many present-day users will not have access to it and may well think that pages 17 through 163 are quoted from the original, citing or quoting them as such, resulting in lasting confusion. If care had been taken to avoid this confusion, the book would have been a much more valuable contribution to Tahitian botany. It is not a sufficient excuse to say that the work is not intended for botanists, as botanists will surely use it. And, in this reviewer's opinion, it is equally

important to confuse neither the general, nonbotanical user nor the botanist.

F. R. Fosberg
Smithsonian Institution

Marion Kelley, *Nā Mala o Kona, The Gardens of Kona: A History of Land Use in Kona, Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Department of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, 1983. Pp. xviii, 122, maps, illustrations, bibliography, appendixes. Paper \$8.00.

This monograph is a historical survey of the changing land use patterns of the Kona district from traditional times to the present. The general character of the extensive Kona field system observed at first contact must be seen as the "end result of possibly a thousand years or more of occupation and cultivation by Hawaiian horticulturalists." Though the water resources necessary for sustaining such large-scale agricultural activity were generally minimal, the "Kona system suggests some kind of centralized authority." Kelly suggests that important decisions regarding planting and harvesting strategies and corresponding population pressures required considerable coordination in order to maximize productivity and resource utilization. Though she falls short of following the "hydraulic" theory of social organization, Kelly believes that the values of Hawaiian society were "rooted in the efforts of the people to obtain a positive response to energy they devoted to sustenance."

Cash cropping as a major commercial activity began in the early 1840s with coffee. Cattle ranching followed, which increased the acreage of grassland and reduced the remaining forest lands. Exotic plant species then began to establish themselves in large numbers. The corresponding effect on the human population was to force the *kuleana* land owners to abandon their lands because of the high cost of reclaiming such land for more productive use. Consequently, many of them left for the port towns or entered into the labor force of larger land owners.

Recent urbanization of the North Kona area has been of three major types. Commercial property development consists largely of shopping centers, banks, and shops. Resort development, characterized by hotel and condominium construction, has occurred along oceanfront property. Residential subdivisions, on the other hand, are situated upland near major highways. Currently tourism and real estate are the largest commercial activities in North Kona. Indeed, the last twenty years of development have set the pace for the next twenty.

Kelly's work is useful and innovative. She uses interviews with Kona residents to supplement her documentary research, thus adding a new and more human dimension to the historical tableau. What emerges in the end is the domination of land use activities by a few landowners, in both traditional and modern times. While it is readily acknowledged that small farming operations are still dispersed throughout the district, approximately eleven landowners, public and private, still comprise the major estates in the area.

Generally, the Bishop Museum anthropological reports have been dominated by archaeological monographs. While such publications are important, they have been useful primarily to academics. In general this trend has meant that more has been learned about less. Kelly's work, with a handful of others, is a refreshing departure from the rarified and parochial jargon of archaeology.

William E. H. Tagupa
Office of Hawaiian Affairs
State of Hawaii

The Politics of Evolving Cultures in the Pacific Islands. Proceedings of a Conference Sponsored by The Institute for Polynesian Studies. Laie, Hawaii: The Institute for Polynesian Studies, 1982. Pp. 365. \$19.95.

The central motif of *The Politics of Evolving Cultures in the Pacific Islands* is only coyly intimated by its title. One could be excused for suspecting that the anthology might be an exercise in political science from the reference to politics, or an aspect of area studies by the mention of the Pacific Islands. While many of the contributions to this collection are drawn from one or the other (or both) traditions, the underlying theme for the entire work is grounded firmly in political anthropology. More particularly, the volume explores the concept of political culture and the influences that have modified or are continuing to affect the political cultures of the Pacific Islands.

Political scientists may question the attribution of political culture to anthropology given the concept's long, if controversial, career in their discipline. However, the emphasis and usage of the term in this volume of collected papers from the February 1982 conference owe their debt of inspiration to anthropology. Even the format of the work underscores this approach by apportioning the substantive contributions along the

great ethnogeographic divisions of anthropology—Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia. (Although, perhaps unexpectedly for a conference organized by The Institute for Polynesian Studies, not only is the allocation to the three areas unequal but the Polynesian section is limited to three entries, two of which center on New Zealand.)

One of the consequences of this general approach to political culture is that the level of analysis tends to be at the island level or lower. Examples here include Peter Black's assessment of "The In-Charge Complex and Tobian Political Culture," Glenn Petersen's review of "Ponape's Body Politic: Island and Nation," Donald Shuster on "More Constitutions for Palau," Richard Feinberg's treatment of the "Structural Dimensions of Sociopolitical Change on Anuta, Solomon Islands," and Lamont Lindstrom on "Cultural Politics: National Concerns in Bush Areas on Tanna (Vanuatu)." With the exception of the two introductory chapters (one a keynote address on the responsibilities of academic observers by *a* doyen if not *the* doyen of Pacific Islands-oriented political scientists, Norman Meller, and the other a provocative survey of the role of political science in the teaching of Pacific Island politics by Stephen Levine), only Peter Larmour's "Alienated Land and Independence in Melanesia" and Ted Wolfers' study of the emergence of provincial governments in Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands treat themes on something larger than the national level.

The narrow focus of the individual contributions does not, of necessity, present a problem and, indeed, could well be regarded as a virtue under some circumstances. Nevertheless, in the field of Pacific Islands studies there is no agreed framework for research or common theoretical explanations which would automatically insert these individual studies into a larger mosaic of understanding. It may be that no unifying theoretical perspectives can be developed which could give Pacific Islands studies a veneer of sub-disciplinary coherence, but, should such prove to be the case, it ought to be demonstrated rather than assumed.

This is not to suggest that none of the works in this volume offer any general theoretical or conceptual conclusions. Yaw Saffu's "Aspects of the Emerging Political Culture of Papua New Guinea," the chapter by Daniel Hughes and Stanley Laughlin, Jr. entitled "Key Elements in the Evolving Political Culture of the Federated States of Micronesia," and that by Black on the Tobians specifically raise theoretical concerns. Yet, the theories are not drawn from any uniqueness of the South Pacific political experience but rather the Pacific Islands are used as laboratories to test theories or concepts from elsewhere. It would seem a pity, somehow, if the politics of this region were doomed only to provide sui

generis examples of exotica rather than to make contributions to the mainstream of political studies.

The absence of theory undoubtedly helps to explain two other characteristics of these papers. A large number of the works spend a significant proportion of their space on what can be termed "scene-setting." Most authors in this field (*mea culpa* also!) assume few readers will be well versed in the material they wish to cover and therefore give extensive historical or anthropological background before embarking on their primary topics. Then, perhaps because of inertia created through this scene-setting exercise, most continue with this historical-descriptive approach to present their data. Katherine Nakata, with her use of survey data in "The Costs of Fa'a Samoa Political Culture's Complementarity with the Modern World System," was one of the few to break the historical-descriptive pattern. The chapters by Larmour and Wolfers similarly are noteworthy for their use of comparative data.

Paralleling the motif of political culture throughout most of the contributions is the theme of colonialism (or a variant such as decolonization). The impact of the colonial experience clearly has transformed political attitudes and orientations in the Pacific Islands. James Jupp reviews its impact on the national politics of Vanuatu, Carl Lande assesses the consequences for attitudes toward entrepreneurship in PNG, Marjorie Smith examines the ramifications of trusteeship on land tenure in Micronesia, and Alan Clark considers the implications for partisan electioneering in New Caledonia. The issue is so ubiquitous, in fact, that few, if any, of the contributors fail to touch on it either explicitly or implicitly. Yet with the exception of the TTPI and New Caledonia the subject itself is substantially retrospective. This emphasis therefore suggests that our analysis of political events in the Pacific Islands is still very much at the stage of data gathering and reflection on how we got to where we are.

Lest these observations be taken as criticisms of the works in this volume, it should be pointed out that these papers are fairly representative of the state of the art in Pacific Islands political studies. There is the inevitable unevenness of a cross-disciplinary anthology, but this is not strikingly different from similar works. Overall, the organizers and contributors have grounds for being pleased with the relatively high standards achieved.

But here is the rub. The methodological rigor of Pacific Islands studies is still rather "spongy." The organizers and contributors are to be congratulated not so much for the content of their proceedings but for having recognized the need to hold the conference that gave rise to these

proceedings. It is now up to the rest of us to accept the challenge posed by the Institute's director, Jerry Loveland, when he referred in the volume's preface to the "professional study of Island politics." This work is certainly a step in the right direction.

R. A. Herr
Visiting Professor
University of Hawaii, Manoa

Paul Sillitoe, *Roots of the Earth: Crops in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983. Pp. xvi, 285, maps, figures, tables, plates, references, index, appendixes. \$35.00.

The title and subtitle of this latest book from Paul Sillitoe's prolific pen imply both more and less than what it actually contains. Those looking for a compendium of information on "Crops in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea" might be disappointed to discover that the book focuses almost entirely on the Wola people, one group of Mendi-speakers in the Southern Highlands Province. On the other hand, while sweet potatoes and other tubers contribute disproportionately to the diet of the Wola (as is true for other New Guinea highlanders), it is misleading to say that "the 'fruits of the earth' are largely roots" (p. 1). While such a phrasing leads to a catchy book title, the prospective reader might not guess initially that the majority of plant species considered here, and well over half of the Wola-named cultivars, are "Greens," "Shoots and Stems," "Fruits," "Inedibles," and "Other Crops" (covered in detail in Chaps. 3-7, pp. 53-136). Moreover, Wola crops "amount to only a fraction of their region's total plant life" (p. 2). Thus the book, which deals only with plants cultivated in gardens, is only a very partial "ethnographic flora" (p. xiii), albeit one focusing on the plants that will be of interest to the widest audience.

Despite these infelicities in labeling, however, there is much of interest inside the package for readers with a wide variety of concerns since it contains a potpourri of information, painstakingly collected during nearly three years of fieldwork, and organized, with varying success, around several goals.

"On one level this is an ethnographic flora, devised to facilitate the identification of the plants discussed" (p. xiii), presenting the "botanical facts . . . in layman's language with the intention of helping others to

identify and come to know the crops discussed" (p. 4). "On another level," Sillitoe wants to use the "floristic accounts as a map and compass," to explore "the factors that condition and circumscribe" Wola perceptions of their crops (p. xiii), that is, "to give a Wola-centric account of their crops: to describe how they see and classify them, how they cultivate them, how they think they grow, how they use them, and so on" (p. 1). Finally, noting a contrast in the ethnobotanical literature between studies that emphasize plant uses and those more concerned with classification or "conceptual ordering," the author seeks to "redress this imbalance [*sic*] and demonstrate that the integration of the . . . functional and cognitive approaches can benefit both" (p. 2). None of these objectives are fully realized, in part because of the enormity of the task involved, but also because Sillitoe was trained in neither botany nor ethnobotany, having begun his fieldwork with "no idea of the difference between a sweet potato and a yam" (p. 4). While he appears to have learned a good deal of botany since then, he still has a rather muddled view of the "cognitive" approach to ethnobiology which he hopes to combine with "functional praxis" (p. xiv).

The "flora," which takes up about one-half of the text (pp. 29–136), is the most successful part of the book, providing detailed accounts of each Wola crop, including Wola, English, and Latin names; the plant's probable origin; morphological descriptions (including effective line drawings); and discussions of Wola cultivars and techniques of cultivation. To some extent, Sillitoe works at cross-purposes in trying to provide information peculiar to the Wola (e.g., criteria used in distinguishing among cultivars, names for various plant parts or stages, parts eaten, and planting techniques) and, at the same time, constructing a guide for the horticultural novice (e.g., by discussing plant features "in English categories, some of which vary notably from those of the Wola," p. 12, n. 12). The result is neither a true "ethnographic flora" nor a completely satisfactory tool for the layman. Suitably revised, however (e.g., by substituting New Guinea Pidgin expressions, as provided in Appendix I, for the Wola terms), the "flora" could be a useful and inexpensive paperback field manual for anthropologists whose primary field concerns lie elsewhere.

The second half of the book addresses the goals of placing Wola "perceptions" of their crops in a wider context and integrating "functional" and "cognitive" approaches to understanding why they categorize and think about their crops as they do. Chapters 8–10 consist largely of previously published discussions concerning informants' disagreements when actually identifying cultivars and "genders" ascribed to various

crops. For the most part, these analyses strike one as ad hoc attempts to deal with a large amount of varied information, trying to find order in materials that apparently were not all collected with these issues in mind. The analyses are unsatisfying, in part because of their loose integration, in part because they are based on a rather confused understanding of how ethnobiologists order "concrete classifications" (with the Wola material not nearly as chaotic as Sillitoe makes it appear), and in part because of the author's quasi-quantitative approach, with various "associations" and "correlations" asserted to exist on the basis of sixty-one figures and forty-six tables without a single statistical technique applied in the entire book.

The author has clearly put a great deal of effort into this compilation of what comes across as everything about Wola crops he could find in his field notes. Some of the data are unusual, most of them are interesting, and researchers with various special interests will find useful information and stimulating ideas. Sillitoe is to be commended for providing far more detailed ethnobotanical information than is customary from ethnographers, but an ethnobotany of the Wola, or of their crops, remains to be written.

Terence E. Hays

Department of Anthropology and Geography
Rhode Island College

Ronald Takaki, *Pau Hana: Plantation Life and Labor in Hawaii, 1835-1920*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983. Pp. 224, illustrations. \$14.95.

"I say that life on a plantation is much like life in a prison," says a worker in Ron Takaki's *Pau Hana: Plantation Life and Labor in Hawaii*, a long-overdue general survey of the plantation worker's experience circa 1835-1920. Although often too superficial and sentimental to be considered really critical scholarship, Takaki's is a warm, empathetic account written with feeling and a sense of allegiance to the nameless thousands who labored in the fields and mills. It is of significance precisely because it does not shrink from exploring the brutality and suffocation of the human spirit that were at the core of the plantation system. Indeed, this book provides reinforcement for the view developed by John Reinecke and other plantation scholars that the worker's lot on the prewar Hawaii plantations lay somewhere between

a Mexican peon on an early twentieth-century *finca* and an indentured servant in colonial America.

Back in the late 1930s, the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, alarmed by reviving unionism and some New Deal criticism of Hawaii's "peculiar institution" (plantation authoritarianism), sponsored a series of books and public relations campaigns to convince people both inside and outside the islands that the plantations were rustic communities of happily toiling folk content with their quaint cottages and "the most favorable living and working conditions" of anybody living in the tropics. This romance of plantation life has, however, been in disfavor for a while now. Certainly, two of the major studies of Hawaii's history, Lawrence Fuchs' *Hawaii Pono* and Gavan Daws' *Shoal of Time*, both portray the plantation environment as harshly repressive, semi-feudal domains populated by lords and serfs. Takaki's work, however, is the first to focus our attention completely on the plantation worker. It is a cane level view of Hawaii, and that is both its strength and its limitation.

The plantations are for Takaki, in one word, *betrayers*. What they betray is nothing less than the American Dream carried by the Chinese and Portuguese and Japanese and Korean immigrants to the islands they hailed as the Land of Glory, the Sandalwood Mountains, Terra Nova. These were men and women, come to escape the miseries of landlessness, peonage, century-old abuses, and iron-bound class hierarchies. Locked in by history, they would use Hawaii to recreate their own liberating history. Some came as sojourners wanting only to accumulate enough to return to Kwangtung and the Illocos and rural Hiroshima as well-to-do men; but others, many others, hungered "to be something, to own land," to express their lives in ways denied to them at home. To find some dignity and autonomy.

What they found instead (almost from the moment they walked off the boat in Honolulu harbor) was a harshly regimented, racist order controlled by the *luna's* snakewhip, the camp policeman, the plantation manager ruling as local potentate. In retrospect, the plantations in Hawaii abused the aspirations of immigrant and second generation workers, much as the Appalachian mines did the Welsh and Irish and Poles; the railroads, the Irish and Chinese; the garment factories, the Jews and Hispanics. Stranded thousands of miles from their cultural base, the immigrants could choose to endure the hardships of the plantation passively, struggle to change the shape of their Hawaii, or flee. Indeed, they did all three.

The twin themes of Takaki's book are oppression and resistance. For

him, the plantation was always "contested terrain" where the masters (quite literally) held the whip hand while the workers were continually refining their methods of resistance; resistance varied from sabotage, feigned illness, desertion and slowdowns on an individual or small group level, to massive strikes that paralyzed the entire plantation system and challenged the reigning authority. The struggle begins with the first sugar plantation at Koloa, Kauai, in the 1830s—where Hawaiian workers, confronted with a hard-driving boss, quickly learned the art of malingering on the job and forging coupons to purchase things at the company store—and continues through the great broken strikes of 1909 and 1920.

The relationship of power in the plantation situation was always heavily weighted toward the plantation establishment. The workers, Takaki explains, "reduced to commodities . . . were placed in a labor market where planters inspected them and chose the ones they wanted, and the sugar agencies made selections and filled orders for the plantations." From the shrieking of the 5 A.M. "get up, get up" whistle, workers were deprived of any semblance of autonomy over their lives, dehumanized into factors of production. Herded from one work site to the next, working bent over for hours under a fierce subtropical sun, they waded across what must have seemed like endless yellow-green fields under the close scrutiny of men on horseback. Takaki is quite masterful at weaving the illuminating quote into his narrative. There is the Norwegian, for example, who expresses the disillusionment prevailing among all ethnic groups: "Our situation is daily becoming less endurable and we would advise our countrymen not to listen to talk of eternal summer and tropical fruits."

As a counterpoint to the plight of the plantation worker, Takaki takes us into the mindset of those who owned and managed the plantations. Through internal company documents, we catch glimpses of how they schemed to divide and rule the many different nationalities they brought to Hawaii, how they used every possible maneuver to maintain a cheap and docile labor force. In time, they developed plantation paternalism to quite the fine art; a judicious mix of strikebreaking, blacklists, violence, informers, *and* swimming tanks, medical services, baseball teams, churches. Time and again the planters showed how remarkably flexible they were in meeting new challenges to their absolute control over labor. When Hawaii was annexed at the turn of the century, the planters were forced to sacrifice their much beloved contract labor system. Naturally, thousands of "their" workers immediately fled to the higher wage West Coast. The planters reacted with vigor,

placing restrictive taxes on mainland labor recruiters, politicking to have Asian emigrants to Hawaii barred from entering the continental U.S., and formulating a new bonus system calculated to tie their workers to the plantation. It worked wonders. When the Japanese proved strike-prone, there were the Filipinos to be brought in to restore a measure of discipline. Both in 1909 and 1920, Takaki describes how they brutally crushed large-scale plantation strikes, then granted some of the strikers' demands at their own discretion.

Hawaii's sugar planters, it seems, in a world full of poor people with their own individual dreams, were never short of new labor resources to exploit, never lacking some angle, always one step ahead of the workers who, divided by ethnicity and enforced segregation, united only very slowly.

Sometimes *Pau Hana* falls into the trap of romanticizing the "working class culture" that grew up in the plantations and (it is said) transcended the various ethnic components of the camps. But Takaki wisely refrains from making too many claims here, from arguing for a solidarity that did not exist, or seeing the creation of a unity that could mitigate the harshness of individual lives. He recognizes that the widespread escape into drinking and gambling and dancehalls derived from "the emptiness plantation laborers felt on weekends as well as the painfulness of their meaningless work during the week." He understands the terrible pain of men who having "failed to realize their dreams of wealth . . . had allowed the years to pass and had awakened one morning to see the wrinkled faces of old grey-haired bachelors greeting them on bathroom mirrors."

Pau Hana's strength lies in its clarity, its able use of English language sources, its determination to extract the essence of experience from the thoughts of those who lived it. Above all, Takaki has chosen to view his plantation from the camp itself, the hot, dusty, red-earth fields of caneland, the wooden porches of the plantation cottages where workers sat and smoked and mused after a long day in the fields. This gives the book its power and relevance. At its best, it is a testimony to the enduring human struggle for dignity, to the powers of human resilience.

There are flaws. Takaki's is the small, personalized picture of plantation life, yet we often lack the larger picture to make some sense of what is happening in the camps. For instance, in discussing William Hooper's Koloa enterprise, the author tells us, "Hooper opened the way for the development of a corporate dominated sugar economy and a paternalistic racial and class hierarchy in the islands." Hooper, convenient symbol that he may be, did no such thing. It was the global expansion of the

American economy to the Pacific coast, the settlement of California, and the creation of profitable markets for sugar at the time of the American Civil War that set up Hawaii as a large-scale exporter of the "white gold." The real establishment of the islands as "the sugar raising slope of the Pacific" was effected in 1875 when the United States passed the Reciprocity Treaty. In one stroke, Hawaii became economically dependent on the U.S. market, sugar was enthroned as king, and the need for plantation labor made urgent.

Takaki neglects to provide a useful framework for the growth and development of a plantation society. He also neglects to deal with sugar production as a *system in itself*. That is, how the cyclical growing period of the crop and worldwide competition resulted in sugar societies in the Pacific, the Caribbean, and Indian Ocean that had some remarkable similarities. Some discussion of the dynamics of sugar production and what this meant for Hawaii would have been invaluable to understanding the manner in which plantation life was structured.

The "small world" of the plantation is the book's subject, but even here the coverage is too superficial, too thin. The author makes a strong statement about the importance of some aspects of camp life, then glosses over them and passes on. We are left awaiting some deeper explanation. Pidgin receives two pages; likewise the role of religion is reduced to a handful of paragraphs. The introduction of family life into the plantation environment, the occupational structure, the working class culture of the camps are mentioned as significant, but much too briefly, almost in passing. The Big Five remain mysterious molochs lurking in the background offstage.

And some of Takaki's assertions are highly questionable. For instance, did the 1920 strike lay the basis for multiethnic unionism, which came only two decades later? *Pau Hana* concentrates almost exclusively on the plantation "laborer," thereby implying that this was the only position non-white workers held. However, even during the early twentieth century there was a substantial group of skilled Asian workers employed in the plantation shops and mills. It seems to this reviewer that Takaki, in trying to create a common denominator for the different ethnic groups in the camps, in trying to emphasize the oneness of experience, ignores the evidence that different groups had different experiences. Sometimes, very different. All of this bears the mark of a rush to publication on the part of author and publisher.

Ron Takaki's *Pau Hana* fills a void in plantation scholarship. It should be read and appreciated. And we still await a more profound interpretation of the plantation experience, one that probes deeply into the

entire socioeconomic culture that grew up around the plantation, one that uses a more varied array of sources, one that asks the question: How does the plantation experience continue to shape today's Hawaii?

Noel J. Kent
Ethnic Studies Program
University of Hawaii

In the Spring 1982 issue of *Pacific Studies*, an article, "Vanuatu Values: A Changing Symbiosis," by Robert Tonkinson appeared without his consent. The editor regrets this unfortunate error.

THE ROUND TABLE

The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs

The January 1983 issue marked the revival of THE ROUND TABLE under a new editor, Dr. Peter Lyon, and a new publisher, Butterworth Scientific, but true to its traditions in providing lucid analysis and commentary about the contemporary Commonwealth and international affairs, with occasional articles on themes of historical interest. In addition to the main articles and book reviews, there are shorter pieces that monitor and comment on current Commonwealth activities.

The journal is pre-eminently a principal expression of informed opinion, analysis and judgement regarding the contemporary Commonwealth, its member governments and peoples, and the forces and influences affecting and animating them. Each issue is concerned with events and trends of topicality and importance both on the pan-Commonwealth stage and within individual member countries.

Articles from 1983 issues

<i>Sir Cyril Pickard</i>	Fortress Falklands? The real lessons of the Franks Report
<i>Sir Neil Marten</i>	Britain's aid policy
<i>John W. Halmes</i>	Canadian - American relations - Vive la différence
<i>D. Cameron Watt</i>	Towards a new order for the world's oceans?
<i>Keith Jackson</i>	The New Zealand preoccupations - politics, sport and trade
<i>Ralph R. Premdas and Jeffrey S. Steeves</i>	The Solomon Islands: Problems of political change
<i>Michael Leifer</i>	Anglo - Malaysian alienation
<i>Ajijuna Kamangara</i>	The Sri Lankan presidential election
<i>William Gutteridge</i>	Namibia: A role for the Commonwealth?
<i>Hans H. Indorf</i>	Political dimensions of interregional cooperation: ASEAN and the EEC
<i>Isaac B. Bothomani</i>	Regional cooperation for development and economic liberation in Southern Africa
<i>A. J. R. Groom</i>	Commonwealth arts: An emerging dimension
<i>Frank E. Manning</i>	Carnival and the West Indian diaspora
<i>John Pinder</i>	Prophet not without honour: Lothian and the federal idea
Plus: series on "The Unofficial Commonwealth"; Bookshelf: Commonwealth Notebook; etc	

For further information and specimen copy please contact:

Butterworth Scientific
Limited P.O. Box 63,
Westbury House, Bury
Street, Guildford, Surrey,
GU2 5BH, UK
Telephone: 0483 31261
Telex: 859556 SCITEG G

MANKIND SPECIAL ISSUES



Reinventing Traditional Culture: the Politics of Kastom in Island Melanesia.

Guest editors: Roger M. Keesing and Robert Tonkinson.

Includes papers by Lamont Lindstrom, Margaret Jolly, Ben Burt,
Roger M. Keesing and Robert Tonkinson.

Published August 1982, 104 pp. — Australia \$8, Overseas \$A10, postage paid.
'... an important contribution to the ongoing debate'. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*.

'... a collection of considerable comparative interest and contemporary relevance'. *Pacific Viewpoint*.



Concepts of Conception: Procreation Ideologies in Papua New Guinea.

Guest editor: Dan Jorgensen.

Includes papers by Margaret Holmes Williamson, Mark Mosko, Susan P. Montague, Dorothy and David Counts, Dan Jorgensen, David B. Eyde and Roy Wagner.

Published August 1983, 84 pp. — Australia \$10, Overseas \$A12, postage paid.



Spirit Cults and the Position of Women in Northern Thailand.

Guest editors: Paul Cohen and Gehan Wijeyewardene.

Includes papers by Andrew Turton, Ann Hale, Margo McMorran, Anan Ganjanapan, Gehan Wijeyewardene, Richard B. Davis, Paul Cohen, Ananda Rajah, Christine Mougne, Walter Irvine and Peter Hinton.

Available late August 1984. — Australia \$12, Overseas \$A14, postage paid.



All special issues to be ordered from Mankind Secretary, C/—Department of Anthropology, University of Sydney, N.S.W. 2006, Australia. Personal cheques in \$US equivalents are acceptable.

MANKIND appears three times a year. It welcomes subscriptions and contributions. Individual subscriptions are currently \$A32, \$US33. Personal cheques in both U.S. and Australian currencies are acceptable, and should be payable to MANKIND at the above address Please enquire for dealer's and institutional rates.

This Precious Foliage.

PAMELA WATSON

Pituri was to the Aborigines what nicotine is to the Europeans. This paper discusses the cultivation, production, uses and trading of the only known drug to be used by the Aborigines and possibly the only 'cultivated crop' to be used in trading.

The whereabouts of Pituri bushes was a closely guarded secret. Power and authority flowed to the old men who could guarantee supply.

The author suggests that Aborigines with access to the drug may have been addicted rather than habituated, as previously supposed.

OCEANIA MONOGRAPH No. 26

Available from - The Secretary, Oceania Publications, Mackie Building, University of Sydney. Sydney. N.S.W. 2006. Price - \$8.70

ANUTA

Social Structure of a Polynesian Island

Richard Feinberg

"Unequalled as far as I know in the published Polynesian ethnographies is the massive summary of personal records. . . . these data and the related genealogies can be of great value for historical demographers in Oceania. . . .

"In addition to its value as a piece of Polynesian ethnography, a description of a remote and hitherto unstudied society, the book makes significant contributions of a wider nature. One is its importance from the comparative Polynesian standpoint. Since it fills a gap both linguistically and institutionally in our knowledge of the western Polynesian outliers, it presents a new set of variations for consideration in the Polynesian field as a whole. . . .

". . . Richard Feinberg's analysis in this book, with its very detailed quantitative data, gives magnificent material for studying the relations between demography, environment and society in small units of this changing world." —from the Foreword by Sir Raymond Firth

391 pp., \$14.95, paper. Published by The Institute for Polynesian Studies, Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus. Distributed by University of Hawaii Press. ISBN 0-939154-23-4

Tahitian Society

Before the Arrival of the Europeans

Edmond de Bovis

Translation and Introduction by Robert D. Craig

Observations of a French Naval officer regarding the history, customs, religion, and government of Tahiti over a hundred years ago. Second Edition, paper, 75 pages, **\$6.95**. ISBN 0-939154-04-8

The Marquesas Islands

Their Description and Early History

Reverend Robert Thomson (1816-1851)

*Edited with introduction, notes, bibliography, and index
by Robert D. Craig*

A valuable document of the Marquesas just before their rapid decline and depopulation. Second Edition, paper, 83 pages, **\$6.95**. ISBN 0-939154-05-6

Anutan Concepts of Disease

A Polynesian Study

Richard Feinberg

Enlightening account of social structure and social control intimately tied into the concept of disease held by the Polynesians on the island of Anuta. Paper, 51 pages, **\$6.95**. ISBN 0-939154-03-X

The Language of Easter Island

Its Development and Eastern Polynesian Relationships

Robert Langdon and Darrell Tryon

Historian Langdon and linguist Tryon present unexpected conclusions on the prehistory of Easter Island. Paper, 82 pages, **\$6.95**. ISBN 0-939154-32-3

The Hawaiian Poetry of Religion and Politics

Some Religio-Political Concepts in Postcontact Literature

John Charlot

Based almost exclusively on the study of primary Hawaiian-language sources, this study demonstrates the value of chants and songs as sources of information for the study of postcontact Hawaiian history. Supplemented by extensive notes and appendixes. Paper, 96 pages, **\$12.00**. ISBN 0-939154-38-2

The Institute for Polynesian Studies
Monograph Series

Distributed by University of Hawaii Press

Hawaiian Genealogies

Volume One

Edith McKinzie

edited by Ishmael W. Stagner

Hawaiian Genealogies is an invaluable resource for novice Hawaiian genealogists. The three-volume series will contain genealogies published in Hawaiian newspapers up to 1949 when the last Hawaiian language paper ceased publication. The genealogies and their explanations are given in the original Hawaiian with English translations interspersed, thus retaining the uniqueness of the old language while adding present-day clarity. Many of the original printer's errors have been either corrected or foot-noted.

The first volume, covering the period from 1842 to 1896, contains all the royal lines plus many of the major chiefly lines. The lists have been cross-checked for accuracy using Kamakau, Fornander, and Malo wherever possible. A numbering system for the oral lists aids the checking and cross-referencing of names, and extensive footnotes explain some potentially confusing and inconsistent parts of the genealogical lists. The index of names is a great asset in family research.

Volume two (1858-1920) contains some major priestly lineages unavailable until now. Also included are two family genealogical challenges, as they appeared in newspapers of the time. Both volumes contain lively insights into Hawaiian family life of earlier generations.

128 pp., \$12.95, paper. Distributed by University of Hawaii Press.
ISBN 0-939154-28-5

Volume two to appear early Spring 1986



The Institute for Polynesian Studies

*A Bibliography of
Pacific
Island
Theses and
Dissertations*
William Coppel
Susan Stratigos

This world catalogue of theses and dissertations brings together in one listing the considerable research on the Pacific Islands (excluding New Zealand and Hawaii), their peoples, and the natural environment. The publication is intended to be a comprehensive listing on an international basis, from the earliest relevant dissertation up to and including 1980. It serves a dual purpose, making accessible basic reference data and diverting scholars from unnecessary duplication of research.

All theses and dissertations have been alphabetically arranged. Theses printed at the bachelors and diploma levels have been included as they often represent the only research on the particular topic available. All bibliographical information is presented in the language of the original work, with English translations of titles included. A cross-reference subject index is also included.

William G. Coppel was educated at the University of New Zealand and received his Ph.D. from the University of Southampton. Among his many publications are *A World Catalogue of Theses and Dissertations Concerning the Education of the Peoples of the Pacific Islands*, *Australia in Figures*, *Theses and Dissertations on Papua New Guinea*, and *About the Cook Islands*.

532 pp., \$22.95, paper. Published by The Institute for Polynesian Studies, Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus, in conjunction with Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

Distributed by ANU Press in Australia
Distributed by University of Hawaii Press elsewhere
ISBN 0-939154-33-1

